This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 402519

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ARTES · SCIENTIA · VERITAS
1817
· LIBRARIES ·

ot 10 lots
+ rel. 2 50

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS
1817
LIBRARIES

Lot No.
+ rel. 2 50

COLLÈGE BOURGET
RIGAUD
No. B-9198
Bibliotheque des Professeurs

416

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year 1890,
by ULRIC BARTHE, at the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa.

1871-1890

WILFRID LAURIER

ON THE PLATFORM

COLLECTION OF THE PRINCIPAL SPEECHES MADE IN PARLIAMENT OR BEFORE THE PEOPLE BY THE

HONORABLE WILFRID LAURIER,

P. C., Q. C., M. P.,

Member for Quebec-East in the Commons,

SINCE HIS ENTRY INTO ACTIVE POLITICS IN 1871

COMPILED BY

ULRIC BARTHE,

Illustrated with a portrait of Mr. Laurier and prefaced with a sketch of his career and work

QUEBEC
TURCOTTE & MENARD'S steam printing office, 59, St-Joseph street

1890

122494

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FRONTISPIECE..... .....Portrait of Mr. Laurier

PAGE

DEDICATION..... I

INTRODUCTION:

I.—THE MAN:—

Wilfrid Laurier, L. O. DAVID..... III

Laurier in Parliament, RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.. VIII

Mr. Laurier's home, J. S. WILLISON..... XI

II.—THE WORK, ULRIC BARTHE..... XXI

Mr. Laurier's Parliamentary debut—(TRANSLATION)
Quebec Legislative Assembly, 10th November 1871. 1

Abolition of Dual Representation—(TRANSLATION)
Quebec Legislative Assembly, 24th November 1871... 9

Louis Riel in the Commons—
House of Commons, 15th April, 1874..... 21

The Tariff question in 1877—
House of Commons, 22nd March, 1877 41

Political Liberalism—(TRANSLATION)
Lecture at Quebec, 26th June, 1877..... 51

The Quebec Ministerial Crisis in 1878—
House of Commons, 11th April, 1878..... 81

Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's Act—
House of Commons, 12th March, 1879..... 89

An affecting Scene in the House—
House of Commons, 15th March, 1880..... 111

A Toast to the French Academy—(TRANSLATION)
Banquet to Mr. Louis Frechette, 17th Nov.,1880..... 115

The Construction of the Pacific—
House of Commons, 21st December, 1880 123

Honorable Edward Blake at Montreal—(TRANSLATION)
Banquet to Mr. Blake, 29th March, 1881..... 141

The Ontario Boundary question—
House of Commons, 4th April, 1882..... 147

A question of autonomy—
(The License Act, 1883) 18th March, 1884..... 159

Parliament Life—(TRANSLATION)
Lecture at Montreal, 19th May, 1884..... 171

Another question of Provincial Autonomy—
(The Franchise bill) 17th April, 1885..... 193

The second Rebellion in the North-West—
House of Commons, 7th July, 1885..... 211

The Execution of Riel—
House of Commons, 16th March, 1886..... 251

Mr. Laurier at Toronto—
Horticultural Pavilion, 10th December, 1886 303

Home Rule for Ireland—
House of Commons, 21st April, 1887..... 341

Mr. Laurier as leader of the Canadian Liberal Party — (TRANSL.)
Speech at Somerset, 2nd August, 1887..... 353

Unlimited Commercial Reciprocity—
House of Commons, 5th April, 1881..... 389

Death of Honorable Thomas White—
House of Commons, 23rd April, 1888..... 439

Mr. Laurier before the people of Ontario—
Speech at Oakville, 13th August, 1888..... 441

The Fisheries' Embroglio—
Speech at St. Thomas, (Ont.) 27th August, 1888..... 463

The Fishery dispute—
House of Commons, 26th February, 1889..... 469

The Jesuits' Estates—
House of Commons, 28th March, 1889..... 493

24th June, 1889—(TRANSLATION)
National Banquet at Quebec..... 525

A Message of Peace—
Speech at Toronto, 30th September, 1889..... 533

The Dual Language question—
House of Commons, 17th February, 1890..... 571

Triumph of Provincial Rights,—(TRANSLATION)
Banquet at Montreal, 2nd July 1890 609

CONSULTING INDEX..... 619

1871-1890

WILFRID LAURIER
ON THE PLATFORM

INTRODUCTION

THE MAN

WILFRID LAURIER

Tall, thin and straight as an arrow, with the pale, sickly face of the student, hair chestnut, thick and inclined to curl ; countenance mild, serious and rendered sympathetic by an air of melancholy ; manners plain, delicate, reserved and respect-commanding; voice sweet and sonorous.

Character lofty, peaceful, frank and independent ; a choice nature inclined to the beautiful and the good, loving justice and truth.

Mind upright, broad and luminous : judgment sound, calm and deep ; imagination sufficient ; memory excellent.

The most remarkable Parliamentary orator of the day possessed by Lower Canada. Others may have more brilliant eloquence, more captivating imagery; he has neither the voice, the gesture, nor the fire of the tribune; his temperament like his nature does not lend itself to those impetuous movements, those energetic inspirations, for which certain men are noted. He is not gifted with the energy of Frechette, the fire of Chapleau or the nervous and flowery language of Chauveau, but more than our distinguished orators has he the tone, the method, the loftiness of ideas, the correct reasoning, the purity of diction and the elegance of language which constitute the Parliamentary orator.

Eloquence has often been compared to the torrent which hurls itself with thunder or to the rippling of the brook which flows through flowery meadows.

Mr. Laurier's eloquence resembles neither the one nor the other; it may be compared rather to the pure and limpid waters of the great rivers of our country.

Mr. Laurier's well balanced intellectual faculties produce in him that measured language for which he is distinguished and which so well befits Parliament.

His eloquence springs rather from the mind than from the heart; he does not speak for an hour over a comma as do some lawyers and does not lose himself in the clouds like the poets; no, at a glance, he embraces all sides of a question, seizes its leading principle and draws therefrom a series of reasonings which are connected together like the links of a chain, of close arguments, whose dryness he tempers with noble thoughts and captivating reflexions.

Always master of his thoughts, he never says more than he wants to say and he says it without effort of mind, voice or gesture and without hesitation. His language is so simple and so natural, his delivery so easy and his thoughts so true as to give the impression that any one could do as much. This is precisely the chief merit of the great orators, of Mr. Thiers, for instance, to seem to say just what every one believes that he has already said or thought.

This perfection is not attained without study ; to be able to treat difficult questions so as to make them intelligible to every one, calls for a lucidity, a penetration of mind, which few men possess, and great reasoning power.

Mr. Laurier enjoys the advantage of being a born orator, but he has the merit of having cultivated this splendid natural gift, of having respected it, and of having understood that the orator must be an honest and a good man.

Listen to him and it is at once seen that his language is the echo of conviction, of correctness of mind, and of a noble heart. And the impression which he creates upon his auditory constitutes the greatest and best part of his force and his merit.

Mr. Laurier was born on the twentieth November, 1841, at St-Lin a quiet, modest parish, which little thought, especially then, of producing orators and statesmen. He is the son of Mr. Carolus Laurier, land surveyor. He entered the Assomption college in 1854 and gave early evidence of his literary and oratorical abilities. He was the popular speaker of the college and the framer of its addresses.

Laurier was a good scholar, serious and kindly,

esteemed by his teachers and his comrades and noted already for the politeness and delicacy which are his characteristics at present. He was as a general thing obedient to the rules, but he incurred punishment several times for going without leave to hear the lawyers plead in the village court house or to listen to the popular orators. His vocation was asserting itself in spite of rules and regulations.

Having finished his studies, he went to Montreal to study law with Mr Rodolphe Laflamme, member for Jacques Cartier. His student life was not stormy and dissipated like that of so many young men, who imagine that there remains nothing for them to learn after they leave college.

He was admitted to the Bar in 1864 and practised for two years in Montreal. This was the time when every one was turning lawyer, when talent alone was not enough to get on rapidly. Laurier moreover soon began to feel the first attacks of the disease which for a long time caused much fear to his friends. These reasons induced him to quit the city in 1866 to establish himself at Arthabaska and take editorial charge of *Le Défricheur* in the place of Mr. J. B. Eric Dorion, "*L'Enfant Terrible*," who had just then died.

Le Défricheur ceased to appear some months afterwards and Laurier had the happy thought to devote himself exclusively to his profession, making himself in a short time a reputation as a lawyer which brought him money and acquiring a popularity which led to his election in 1871 to the Local Legislature by a majority of 1000 votes over Mr. Hemming.

The effect which his eloquence produced in Parliament and the applause which it won even from his

adversaries will be remembered. The youthful orator's debut was greeted with flowers and the rising star was saluted on all sides.

At the last general elections for the Federal House, he ran against Mr Tessier and succeeded in getting elected.

Invited to second the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, he at once took his place in the foremost rank of the orators of the Federal Parliament. On that occasion, he yielded too much, perhaps, to the desire to please the majority of the House, by giving expression to ideas which do not quite agree with the opinions to which he has often given utterance in favor of independence.

The English members were unanimous in their praise of Mr Laurier's talent, but they were still more astonished when they heard him deliver in English his splendid speech against the expulsion of Riel. In that speech, Mr Laurier displayed with eclat the correctness of reasoning, power of dialectic and all those eminent oratorical qualities which we have noted.

Mr Laurier speaks English as fluently as French, a precious advantage destined to give him considerable influence in a House almost wholly English.

Laurier is therefore one of the most remarkable men whom the future has in store for us. Lower-Canada has reason to count upon him and he will not disappoint the patriotic hopes inspired by his brilliant debut, for his character is on the same level as his intellect.

L. O. DAVID,

(In the *Courrier de Montréal*, of 14th October, 1874.)

LAURIER IN PARLIAMENT

It is not everyone who pleases who can be a debater in the House of Commons. To command the attention of Parliament, it is not sufficient to have the eloquence which moves and sways the masses, and the man, whose voice and action have over and over again electrified the crowd and aroused frenzied applause, will be hardly remarked by the House How many men gifted with remarkable talents, skilled and cunning in discussion, have miserably failed when they have had to take part in a debate before the House! To be a Parliamentary orator, in the genuine sense of the words, one must bring to the discussion not only an agreeable voice and a chaste style, but a rare faculty of organization, a very practical mind, and a great knowledge of facts. Mr Laurier possesses these qualities and it is enough to once hear him to be no longer astonished at the fact that he has taken rank as the foremost debater of the Parliament. No one else knows so well how to express in correct and flexible language what he wants to say; no one else speaks with so much authority. Partisans or adversaries admit that he speaks as a statesman, not for effect, although his language is musical, but for a real result. With him, each word is weighed and corresponds to an inflexible resolution. Does he state a principle, an idea, which it does not weary to return to, it should be seen with what ability and what resources he attains his object. The harmonious phrase, the sober and methodical gesture, all in Laurier bears the stamp of the originality of his character.

LAURIER AND CHAPLEAU

Here is Chapleau rising to speak. It might almost be said that he is marching to the assault, there is so much movement in him. It is enough to see that blazing eye, that brow freighted with passion, that head thrown back, that hair which he takes a delight in shaking,that open breast waiting for and provoking the fight, to feel that the orator has an absolute confidence in the power of his talent. The clear, resounding voice seizes the audience and holds it under a charm. He concentrates the attention of the House upon himself and always know how to render his speeches attractive by laying stress on happy expressions and emphasizing witty sayings.

On the other hand, look at Laurier! He rises cool and collected. His harmonious voice, his elegant and sober gestures have a soothing effect on his hearers.No incident disturbs his presence of mind. In the face of the greatest danger, he geos to the end of his thought. Everything about him denotes the calmness of a self possessed mind.

Chapleau's eloquence is more animated, more brilliant, more emphatic, more nervous and more theatrical.

Laurier's eloquence is more self contained, more lofty, more noble and more persuasive.

Chapleau's speeches are often captious,diffuse and obscure. Passion and vehemence are their leading features.

Laurier's speeches, on the other hand, are always clear, correct, studied, and his language is elegant and chaste.

Although graver and less pathetic than Chapleau, Laurier sometimes rises to spheres unknown to other orators and which his oratorical genius alone is capable of attaining. His voice then becomes more harmonious and more sonorous and his eloquence assumes such a character of majesty and nobility that it touches your heart and causes you to quiver with enthusiasm.

To sum up, Chapleau is the orator of the crowd and Laurier is above all a Parliamentary orator.

LAURIER BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

Although the House of Commons is the stage on which Mr. Laurier has most displayed his great talents, our leader is not a little indebted for his great popularity to his successes on the hustings. Who does not recall the famous oratorical joust at Longueuil at the election of Mr Prefontaine, on the 30th July, 1886. Mr Laurier spoke before Mr Chapleau, it is true, but he had the ability to destroy in advance all his adversary's arguments. It seems to me that I still see him turning to the Secretary of State and hurling at him this stunning apostrophe: You will speak after me, but I know what you will say and I will therefore answer it at once. For a long time past I have known the circle in which the ball chained to your feet permits you to travel". Fox, the great Fox, could not have characterized more bitingly the humiliating position in which Mr. Chapleau found himself at that time. Another incident will show the enormous

power he wielded over the crowd. I quote the words of my friend Donoso of *L'Union Liberale*:

During the Local elections of 1886, there was a great meeting held of the English speaking electors of Megantic. Fanaticism had done its work; the Orangemen, by means of the Riel question, had aroused the prejudices of the Protestant element against us. One of our friends was concluding his speech, when an Orangeman of the place shouted out in a rage: "none of you have spoken of Riel and none of you will dare to do so!" Yells arose, vociferations broke out, in all directions. Laurier simply replied: "*I will.*" And, worming himself into their sympathies by an appeal to British loyalty and by reminding them of the spirit of tolerance and justice which should animate all the citizens of a mixed country, he related to them the details of the dark tragedy in the North West.

We have been told that that hostile crowd bowed their heads not wholly convinced, but tamed, subjugated by the courage of the man and the eloquence of the orator.

RODOLPHE LEMIEUX,

[In a lecture before the Club National of Montreal, on the 29th November, 1889.]

Mr LAURIER'S HOME

Mr. Laurier's home is a two-storey red brick house, with little attempt at outside ornamentation, with no suggestion of ostentation, hardly suggestive of wealth, but of only moderate means and simple comfort. A verandah runs across the front of the house, to which a high flight of steps ascends. You enter into a wide hall, and are shown into the drawing room to the left. This room runs the full width of the house, and is tastefully, but not extravagantly furnished. There are many pretty and tasteful decorations upon its walls, home pictures that attract the fancy and engage the sympathies, and here or there a statue or a portrait of

some one or other of the Liberal chieftains, from the lessons of whose career Mr Laurier has gathered courage, or formed principle, or caught a pure and lofty inspiration.

Upon the right, entered from the hall, is a parlor, and beyond that is the dining room, all bearing the same marks of quiet elegance, the same absence of lavish display, and all suggestive of the same rare, simple home life in which the Liberal leader and Madame Laurier delight.

The platform at the rear of the house, flanked by a profusion of flowers, is one of Mr Laurier's favorite summer resorts. Here he often does his morning reading. Here in the evening the visitor smokes, if smoke he does, an exercise in which he will not be joined by Mr Laurier, while the host talks in his frank, easy, unaffected way, and "still the wonder grows" at this man's mastery of pure, strong, melodious English.

The grounds are eight acres in extent. The house is approached by a winding drive through a grove of fine young trees. The grounds are broken midway by an abrupt elevation, and the plateau above is reached by a flight of steps or an invigorating climb, as may best suit the fancy of the visitor. The summit of this ridge and the face of the ascending hillside are thick with maples, and all the grounds form a fine natural park which has not been refined out of the rugged image of nature by over-decoration, nor marred in its native beauty by over-cultivation.

THE VOICES OF CHILDREN.

All about and all throughout the house are rare

plants and flowers, of which Madame Laurier is a devoted lover. Nor do you miss the voices of children, notwithstanding that Mr. Laurier and Madame Laurier have no children of their own, for the house seems full of visiting little ones, and Mr. Laurier's unaffected love for his little guests, the attention with which he hears their little grievances and bestows counsel and administers consolation, is one of the finest traits in one of the finest characters in the public life of Canada. The children, too, trust him instinctively, and seek his counsel with simple, delightful confidence, and all their trouble is consoled.

Mr. Blake has this same marked fondness for children, and the little ones go to him with the same instinctive trust. But in the Great Advocate the revelation of this trait is a surprise. In Mr. Laurier it is simply what one expects.

MADAME LAURIER.

In Madame Laurier one finds many of the same qualities which make the character of her distinguished husband. There is the same unaffected friendliness, a refinement of manner and a native kindliness and sympathetic courtesy which put the most retiring visitor completely and forgetfully at home, and which is not less marked in her outside intercourse with the critical and not always sympathetic world of society and of politics. And there is, too, a purpose and a spirit and a self-mastery in this amiable, kindly, admirable woman that would make her very strong in the crises of life. One knows readily that the home is the sphere of her heart and of her thought, and one

recognizes as instinctively that she has the native grace and tact and strength for any place that fortune may call upon her to enter, and that, whatever burden of care and responsibility the future may roll upon Mr. Laurier's shoulders, his wife will never fail to encourage, stimulate and strengthen him.

THE LIBRARY

But naturally the room of supreme interest in the home of Mr. Laurier is the library. There the Liberal leader spends many of his leisure hours, and there he is most likely to lead the talk to topics that reveal his wide range of reading and best betray the solidity of his mind, the grasp and scope of his intellect, the taste and fancy of the critic and scholar.

Perhaps few men in Canada have a finer collection of the best works of French and English literature. Here again the Liberal leader has not aimed at display. His collection of books is a modest one as contrasted with many of the greater libraries that too often signify wealth rather than culture. His books have been selected for the voice within, not for the covering without. They have been read, not simply exhibited, and from the pages of his favorite English volumes he has acquired a command of pure, strong, sympathetic English that has made him the peer of the very masters of this tongue to "which he was not born."

Mr. Laurier has a marked fondness for the best books of philosophy and works of higher research. He has barely patience with the dogmas of warring theologians. He is more than familiar with the

choicest English poetry, and puts Burns in the first rank of poets. But the books of his heart are Shakespeare, Macaulay, the speeches of John Bright, and the few speeches and papers of Lincoln that have been preserved. Lincoln's touching address at Gettysburg and his second inaugural are great favorites with the Liberal leader, and many of the eloquent sentences of John Bright's strong and simple oratory come readily to his lips. On the walls are portraits of the late Hon. George Brown, Louis Joseph Papineau, Gladstone, Edward Blake and other of the great leaders of Liberalism. On the lines of policy laid down by these great men Mr. Laurier lays his faith and shapes his career, and in the simple, masterful English of Bright and Lincoln he reasons and persuades and wins upon the people.

ON THE PLATFORM

For many years Mr. Laurier has been one of the most popular orators of his native province. One of the greatest of his platform successes was his famous address on Liberalism, delivered in the city of Quebec in the summer of 1877. That great speech was pronounced before one of the most cultured audiences that could be gathered in the Ancient Capital, and the orator's was an unequivocal triumph.

One who was present on that occasion told the writer that when Mr. Laurier rose to address the great audience before him he was deathly pale. A momentary fear that he was ill passed upon his friends, a subdued whisper passed from lip to lip, and then for several moments in absolute stillness the orator and

his audience looked into each other's faces. The speaker pronounced his opening sentences with calm and measured deliberation, but the tremor in his voice was hardly concealed; his eyes were yet bravely scanning the bearing and his judgment deliberately searching the temper of his audience. Then as he saw the look of mere curiosity pass from the faces before him and an awakening interest manifest its kindly presence, and the kindling of enthusiasm freshen on the more earnest faces, the tremor passed out of the speaker's voice, and the full courage of confidence came to him, and when he had pronounced the eloquent peroration of that magnificent address he was by common consent more than a politician, more than a brilliant campaigner, more than a mere platform debater. By that noble address he proved himself a profound thinker, a ripe and cultured scholar, and a very master of pure, persuasive oratory. But that method of feeling for the temper of his audience is still a favorite one with the Liberal leader. The opening sentences of his speeches are always pronounced with great deliberateness, and even in his most eloquent and most impassioned passages he never loses his absolute self-mastery. He can fight a mob from the hustings with a quiet, steady self-possession that knows no wavering. He never flinches in the teeth of the most hostile demonstration. He rarely fails to subdue the most turbulent audience to order and decorum. The most brutal partisans yield to his engaging persuasiveness and quiet, uncompromising firmness. But Mr. Laurier is at his best in the House of Commons. There his best eloquence is spoken, his lofty patriotism is most effectively

revealed, and there he rises to his utmost supremacy as the master of men's minds and emotions. By his patient courtesy and kindly considerateness for friend and opponent, he commands the best attention and the best feeling of that assembly. Whatever estimate men of differing opinions may put upon his abilities, few will deny that he is the most popular party leader that has ever sat in the Canadian Parliament.

ELEVATED TO THE LIBERAL LEADERSHIP.

Perhaps few outside of the Liberal Parliamentary party know how hardly Mr. Laurier fought the proposal to elevate him to the Liberal leadership. He is not a man greedy of honor. He has gone to no man seeking gift or place or preferment. He had the confidence of his associates, an honorable place in their councils, and a mode of living suited to his taste and his income. He would not entertain seriously the proposal that he should change all this, advance beyond the limit of his ambition, give himself wholly to the business of politics and take up the burdens and the responsibilities which had broken Alexander Mackenzie in the ripe prime of a stalwart manhood, and had borne down the great frame and the peerless intellect of Edward Blake. One can well understand that Mr. Laurier, knowing as he did the service Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake had given to Canada—for they had no more loyal follower—standing in Mr. Blake's very presence, his magnificent voice still echoing through the Commons Chamber, enthusiasm for the great leader's marvellous resources as a Parliamentary tactician still warm in the hearts of his

followers—for nowhere was Mr. Blake so much a master of his fellows as on the floor of Parliament —knowing all this, and feeling all this, one can understand that Mr. Laurier put from him as unworthy of one poor moment's consideration the nomination for the leadership bestowed upon him by his Parliamentary associates. But the nomination was pressed, urged with increasing persistence and growing unanimity, and at last Mr. Laurier yielded, moved because he was called, not that he would go, and in the hope that he would be asked to give but a temporary service in the high place to which he had not aspired, and which was not of the true purpose of his heart or of his ambition.

Perhaps Mr. Laurier was not alone in the conviction that his assumption of the leadership was but an experiment, and that failure was well within the possibilities. But long before he had completed his first session as Edward Blake's successor there was no voice from the Opposition benches that did not speak with enthusiasm of his patience, and prudence, and courage, and sagacity; and no man among the Liberals of the Commons who was not his devoted friend and follower.

CHARACTER AND METHODS.

He is not viciously aggressive. He is not unwisely pugnacious. But he is very, very firm; a calm, strong, steadfast man, who will not be turned from his purpose while a hope of achievement remains, who will estimate well the strength of the forces that must be overcome, and who has in a very unusual degree that courage that will build for a future triumph on the

fresh ruins of defeat. He has no mind for the paltry jars of rival factions. He could not achieve success through intrigue. The influences which debase and demoralize and corrupt have no place in his methods. He cannot fight well except his heart be in it. His heart is not in the trivialities of parish politics. But this man would be a giant in some great national crisis, and there is no labor or sacrifice he would not give to a cause in which his heart and conscience were engaged. He is not a Radical. He is a Liberal; a Liberal in every conviction of his mind; a strong, brave, independent thinker, and a man whom duty, rather than ambition, will compel to play a great part in the future of his country. As he is esteemed and trusted by his friends, as he is held in regard and honor by his Parliamentary associates, so he deserves to hold the confidence of the whole Canadian people

J. S. WILLISON,

(In the *Toronto Globe* of 30th August, 1889.)

THE WORK

The foregoing gives an idea of the man. The portrait drawn by Mr. L. O. David in 1874 is still, after the lapse of sixteen years, a striking resemblance; and time, far from obliterating its lines, has rather graven them more deeply.

In professing for Mr. Laurier's talent an admiration amounting to the enthusiastic, Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux has not only responded to the impulse natural to a young man, but he has given expression to a sentiment shared by our entire generation.

To better know the new Liberal leader and to make him better known to its readers in the English provinces, the managing editor of the *Globe*, Mr. Willison, has even taken the trouble to seek him out in his rural retreat at Arthabaska and has given us a most charming home picture, which encircles, like a frame of foliage, the fine, calm figure of the thinker the public man and the orator.

I have reserved for myself the task of saying a word as to his work. The sketch which I have the honor to offer to the public has led me to study him thoroughly. One cannot spend months, as I have just done, in association with a man's thoughts, without becoming deeply imbued with them.

***

Written eloquence, stripped of the magic of voice and gesture, is like a bird deprived of its wings

has lost the incessant mobility which charmed and dazzled the hearer, but which at the same time concealed its finer shades, as well as its defects. It is henceforward an anatomical subject laid on the table for dissection and upon which the scalpel may work its will at leisure. Under these conditions, eloquence appeals only to reason and no longer to the senses. Still, those cold, inanimate pages, which I have had to read and re-read so many times, analyze, turn over in all directions, and, so to say, learn by heart, have excited in me the same emotions which must have previously thrilled the numerous audiences of the orator.

The attentive reader, who peruses this volume, will not escape from this mysterious influence. He will not have before him the *mise en scene* of the popular or parliamentary gatherings, always so predisposing to solemn thoughts. He will not see rising up above the thousand curious heads of the crowd or emerging from the horizontal line of the benches of the Commons that tall figure, that pale and meditative countenance, and that large and well developed brow so indicative of strength of mind. His senses will miss the music of that singularly grave voice, of that sonorous accentuation, as classical as the accompanying gesture, never rising above a certain height, except in the great movements, learnedly prepared, and of which Mr. Laurier, unlike his rival in the Commons, Mr. Chapleau, does not make an immoderate use. All these accessories are wanting here. And yet this lifeless stenography, often dull and incomplete, still emits powerful, irresistible galvanic shocks. And upon what does this depend? On

the fact that Mr. Laurier is not a mere rhetorician, that his eloquence is not a marble statue, and that, stripped of the perishable beauty of exterior forms, it still possesses a much more beautiful soul, the soul of thought, true, convinced and strong.

The human mind is so complex that it is a complete study to try to discover the true secret of the talent of a superior man. The humble compiler of Mr. Laurier's speeches believes that he has found it —perhaps without seeking to do so—through the force of circumstances. These speeches were scattered through a hundred different collections and newspapers, and between them there were gaps of time and place, twenty years between the first and the last; but, in bringing them together, I think I have united the thread of Ariadne which runs through them all.

***

Mr. Laurier's style of discussion is a synthesis, just as that of other powerful orators is an analysis. Both he and Mr. Mercier prove, by their extraordinary ascendancy over their contemporaries, that both modes are weapons of equal value in expert hands. Read calmly one of Mr. Laurier's dissertations and what strikes you at the first glance is the perfect clearness of the thought! Listen to Mr. Mercier handling the first subject that suddenly comes up, developing a thesis, relating a fact or rendering an account of an administrative act! there is in what he says something that confounds you—it is the lucidity, the prodigious ease of his language. Mr. Mercier seizes

his question from all sides at once and exhausts his subject; Mr. Laurier inhales at long draughts the essence. The one excels in analyzing a theory; the other in generalizing it. The first co-ordinates and symmetrically arranges his arguments, disposes of each objection in its turn and, according to the common saying, does not overlook a pin's worth; once he has treated a point, he passes on to another, to only revert to it at the conclusion, where the whole constitute a formidable and nearly always victorious line of battle. The second attains effects equally as powerful by devoting himself to the development of a limited number of leading propositions, whose formula, which he even does not always take the trouble to give, stands out triumphant and luminous from the speech in its entirety. Mr. Mercier probes a question to the bottom; Mr. Laurier keeps at a distance from and a sufficient height above it to take it in at a single glance. Both, however, arrive at the same results by different methods; they equally impose silence and command attention and both enlist the admiration of adversaries as well as of friends. The most minute of the two never tires his audience, while the most superficial supplies a complete whole, which leaves no room in the mind for the slightest doubt or uncertainty.

I presume that, before preparing a speech, Mr. Laurier says to himself: Here are two or three considerations which, to my mind, cover the whole debate; they should suffice for me and beyond them I forbid myself to go. And it is within this magic circle that he shuts himself up with his thoughts..... I have used the words " before preparing his speeches, " but

the fact is that Mr. Laurier never writes his speeches; he elaborates, he matures the groundwork, but the brilliant imagery, the sonorous periods, are improvisations. Few men have less of the vanity of the author than he has. I know something of this from having had to collect his speeches here and there, to the best of my knowledge. When I asked his permission to publish them, his first impulse was to try to dissuade me from the work, fearing that no one would purchase it and that I would be a loser, when I already had the certainty of a good sale and every one was wanting to subscribe. He nevertheless kindly placed his collection at my disposal, but it amounted to very little. Not only does he not keep a copy of his own works on the shelves of the library where my colleague, Willison, admired such a fine collection of French and English works, the finest, perhaps, he says, in the country; but Mr. Laurier was quite astounded to discover, after the lapse of years, how abominably he had been translated and badly reported in the *Hansard*. I presume that he has never read his own utterances and that, like all other modest men, he judges himself too severely to look backwards.

***

The pursuit of a fixed idea absorbs his existence. All statesmen have their fixed idea. Mr. Mercier has his in Provincial politics, as Mr. Laurier has his in the Federal sphere. This is the impression which has been left on my mind by a three months' intimacy with his thoughts. His eloquence is an endless variation on a single theme. His first public utter-

ances were inspired by the same sentiment which still moves him to day when he rises to address his fellow citizens, either from the public platform or from his seat in Parliament, in those admirable harangues which ring from one end of the country to the other and even to Europe. His maiden speech in the Legislative Assembly in 1871 produced an extraordinary impression, precisely because it went to the heart of the question which was being discussed. A re-perusal of that speech, in fact, shows that it was more in keeping with the tone of the House of Commons, which the young member was destined to reach before long.

I have described his method as a synthesis; I may describe his entire work as a system. Every thing is connected; his speeches are like the chapters of a book, the periods of a demonstration. It is the persistent outcry of an honest soul, a generous heart and a broad mind against the shameful failures of duty, against iniquity, despotism and injustice, against all that savors of fanaticism and intolerance. The first time he raised his eloquent voice, it was, as he said himself, to tell his country hard truths, and, for the twenty years since that he has been speaking, he has not deviated to the extent of hair'sbreadth from this role of thinker and censor. He always lays his finger on the sore spot and often so unexpectedly and with so sudden a pressure that the sufferer cannot help emitting a cry of pain as well as one of admiration. Now, the diseases of a nation take time to cure, when it is badly governed. Ours has been so badly governed that it has been ailing with the same rheumatism for twenty-five years. Consequently, Mr. Laurier would

create absolutely the same sensation by taking up again in 1890 the same thesis which he maintained in his first Parliamentary speech in 1871. Why? Because the situation has not improved; years have rather aggravated the evil. And to-day he would again thrill the House and the country by repeating his famous words of 1871: " We are told that we are rich... Sir, there are riches and riches.. TANTALUS WAS RICH! He had always before him a table abundantly, sumptuously spread. But the misfortune was that with all this he was eternally dying of hunger". Well, this is still what he has not ceased to repeat in each of his speeches on the economic condition of the country whenever he refers to the question of commercial reciprocity. And it is always as true and as striking as it was twenty years ago.

His work, of which I have collected together all that I could in this book, embraces the entire field of our political, social and national contentions, and yet these six hundred pages of stenography could be compressed into a handful of formulas, of parent ideas, on which Mr Laurier has already spoken volumes without wearying the attention of his admirers, that is to say, of the entire population.

He is above all Canadian in feeling; above all Liberal by instinct and conviction; and above all honest of soul.

He has studied history and knows that the human race has been improved by the crossing of the races, without loosing in any case the traces of their origins. He knows that nature, which is superior to all other forces, effects unaided this transfusion of blood, without pain and without accident. His dream is to see the des-

cendants of the noblest stocks of the old world, English, French, Scotch, Irish, dwelling together harmoniously in this country and marching together in pursuit of that national unity, of which all the varieties of the human race, from the purest white to the deepest black, have so happily found an example in the American Republic. He believes that this problem can only be solved here by union and not by absorption.

The lines which separate us from each other—language and religion—should not, in his opinion, divide us. He considers that English is destined to become the language of the masses in America and French to remain, as in the rest of the world, the language of the drawing-room and of letters. He recommends the study of the two as a complement, a luxury, of education, and he sets the example by speaking both with inimitable perfection.

As for religious disputes, he banishes them from politics. Gallion, pro-consul of Achaia, replied to the Jews of Corinth, who wanted to submit their controversies to him " If some injustice or crime were in question, it would be reasonable, Jews, that I should hear you patiently. But if the question is one of words, names, and of your law, it is for you to see to it. I do not wish to be a judge of these kinds of things." It is this liberty of the religious and national groups, this home rule, this self-government which Mr. Laurier desires. In a word, he believes that it is in the equality of all and not in the subjection of one to another that the solution of the national problem must be sought.

He adores liberty, but with reflexion It is to her that he constantly addresses his sublimest in-

vocations and it was of her that he gave so clear a definition in his lecture of 1877 that it will remain the code of Canadian Liberalism.

He claims to belong to the English Liberal school. He admires the British constitution because it does not pretend to have said the last word for liberty, but leaves the door open to reforms. He is in favor of federations, regarding them as the best means to govern men of different origins and scattered over a vast extent of country. The American system seems to him, in more than one aspect, a model to follow, because the line of demarcation is clearly drawn between the powers of the legislatures and of the central government and constitutional conflicts are left to the decision of the judicial power.

He sees the future from afar. Confederation is not for him the finality of our destinies, but a state of transition, and, when the change comes it will be to take a step forward and not backward.

He is a home-ruler by conviction; the autonomy of the provinces is for him an iron rule, a fundamental principle, from which it is never allowable to deviate, whatever may be the consequences. He is opposed to the Federal *veto*, to *better terms* left to the caprice of governments, in a word, to everything which attacks liberty.

He believes in public virtue and practises it. In his honor, he is not only unassailaible, but unassailed. Calumny has never dared to rise to his height. The worst that malice could ever invent against him was on one occasion to style him a rhetorician without conviction and without energy.

Nothing could be more unjust or more false. His

uprightness proves his conviction; his integrity proves his moral strength. The mere rhetorician places his eloquence at the service of every cause; Mr. Laurier's work is on the contrary a sustained thesis. The man must have an energy of iron to have remained himself, to have preserved his personality intact amidst the contaminations of politics, to have not left a single shred of his reputation on the thorns by the wayside. His greatest adversaries admire and respect him and that is saying all that need be said.

***

He never strives to be witty. But this does not prevent his speeches from bristling with brilliant sayings, repartees and startling apostrophes.

On one occasion, he was handling Mr. McKenzie Bowell, but he was doing it, so to say, gingerly; when the Minister interrupted him with this sardonic remark: " Oh, don't hesitate. I have none of those scruples! " Mr Laurier simply retorted: — " Well, if you have no scruples, I have! " And the House burst into applause.

Parliament will never forget the hearty laugh provoked in 1877 by his reply to the late Mr. Mousseau, who had charged the Ministers with fattening on the sweat of the people. Pointing with his finger to his corpulent adversary, Mr. Laurier exclaimed: " If any one here is fattening on the sweat of the people, which is it—he or I? "

Nor will it ever forget the exclamation: " Too late!..... Too late!..... Too late!....." which he thrice used, after exposing the causes of the rebellion

of 1885, during the debate on Louis Riel's execution. Those were solemn moments. Witnesses of the scene state that, between each of the orator's pauses, there seemed to be an age, that a silence of death brooded over the House, broken only by the terrible monosyllables which summed up the whole drama of the insurrection and each repetition of which went straight to the hearts of the Ministers responsible for those horrors.

There was also a moment of indescribable emotion on the same occasion when the orator, pointing with his finger to the Ministers, exclaimed: "If criminals are wanted, do not seek them among the dead on the battle field or the scaffold: they are here, before us !....."

And that striking saying, which elicited the applause of an English audience, in the very capital of Ontario:—" As long as there are French mothers, our language will not die! "

And that brilliant image of the waters of the Ottawa and the St Lawrence meeting without mingling at the Island of Montreal and forming two parallel currents perfectly distinct to the eye: fit emblem of the Canadian nationality.

Such eloquence commands admiration, and principles, presented in such guise, lose their austerity, The more hard truths are told by the orator thus gifted, the greater is the applause, and the more he castigates, the more is he admired. He started out in 1871 with an absolutely pessimistic address; he was raised to the clouds, and it was said: There is a man! At one bound, he mounted to the Federal Cabinet and then to the command in chief of the Liberal forces. He hurled the blood of the victims of 1885 into the faces of

the Ministers and on the following day the Ministerial press christened him "The silver-tongued Laurier!" He repeats in the heart of Ontario the same language which he uses to his own fellow-countrymen on the most burning questions and the Protestants applaud him, while a London newspaper ranks him among the foremost statesmen of the empire. These are eagle flights, but it is thus that Mr. Laurier proceeds.

Sympathetic reader, I think I have shown sufficient grounds for our mutual admiration of this superior man to save us both from the charge of being enthusiasts.

ULRIC BARTHE.

(*Translated by* J. A. JORDAN.)

MR. LAURIER'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBUT

SPEECH ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

DELIVERED ON THE 10TH NOVEMBER, 1871

IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Mr. Laurier's Parliamentary career began in 1871. At the general elections of that year, which were the second after Confederation and which had resulted in maintaining the Chauveau Administration in office, he had been returned to represent the united counties of Drummond and Arthabaska in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, defeating by a majority of 1000 votes the Ministerial candidate, Mr. Hemming, who had held the seat during the first Parliament. Entering the House while such men of note as Cartier, Cauchon, Langevin, Holton, Fournier, Irvine, Joly, Lynch, Blanchet, Fortin, Robitaille, Cassidy and Bachand still figured on the Provincial scene, the young member for Drummond and Arthabaska modestly took his seat on the rear Opposition benches, but his first Parliamentary speech, of which a translation is appended, at once brought him into full prominence:

MR SPEAKER:

The honorable members, who have proposed the address, have drawn a most attractive picture of the situation of the country. They have vied with each other in efforts to dazzle us with what they have been pleased to pompously term our wealth, prosperity

and happiness. If they are to be believed, Canada is a real land of Cocayne, where everything is lovely and there is nothing left for us to do but to return thanks to Providence and to the Ministry.

But does this picture really portray the truth? I, for one, cannot accept it in that light.

All, who have studied the situation of the country otherwise than on paper and in the seclusion of their own homes, who have had the opportunity of a nearer view of our backward system of agriculture, our timid and vacillating trade and our blighted industry, know full well that the brilliant image evoked by the hon. members, who proposed the address, is not the reality, but a deceptive mirage.

If the purely political and social aspect of the situation were the only question, I would accept without reserve all that has been said by the hon. members.

Undoubtedly, our situation, viewed from the merely political and social standpoint, is excellent, thanks to the fundamental principle of our constitution—the principle of free and representative government. It is due to this principle that the diverse elements, which compose our population, have been enabled to unite and form a compact and homogeneous whole, yet leaving to each its character and its autonomy. Certainly, the fact is one of which we can be justly proud that so many different races and so many opposite creeds should find themselves concentrated on this little corner of earth and that our constitution should prove broad enough to leave them all plenty of elbow room, without friction or danger of collision and with the fullest latitude to each to speak its own tongue, practise its own religion, retain its own customs and enjoy its equal share of liberty and of the light of the sun.

I myself have the honor to represent a county in which are grouped all shades of race and creed and am happy to be able to bear testimony publicly to this state of things.

But there is another side to the situation; there is the

ECONOMIC SIDE

and I do not hesitate to say that it seems to me dark, very dark, indeed.

We have been told that we are rich and prosperous. But is this the case? Question all classes of society, the merchant, the banker, the shop-keeper, the member of the l beral professions, the farmer, the simple mechanic, and among all, without exception, you will find the same story of hard times, of uneasiness, of suffering and languor, denoting that there is something wrong somewhere.

It might be almost said that this country is placed under an immense pneumatic machine and that it is writhing and struggling in vain to get to its lungs a few particles of an air which is becoming more and more rarefied.

This is the truth! This is the true situation!

He is blind who does not see it, and he is guilty, who, in seeing, does not admit it.

Still, it is being constantly dinned into our ears that we have mines, timber, resources of all kinds—that we are rich, in fact. Sir, there are riches and riches.

TANTALUS WAS RICH.

He had always an abundantly, a sumptuously served table spread before him; but the trouble was that, in sight of all this abundance, he was eternally starving.

Our position very much resembles that of Tantalus. An infernal hand seems to be always with drawing our riches whenever we strive to grasp, them.

The man, who found a bag of gold dust in the desert, considered himself rich. But shortly afterwards, when he was dying of hunger over his treasure,

he no doubt exclaimed in bitterness of spirit that a simple piece of bread would have been preferable, as it would have saved him.

We also are expiring over our treasures and year after year the flood of those who are leaving our riches and going to the United States to seek the morcel of bread that will save them goes on steadily increasing.

Once more, I say, this is the real situation. God forbid! that I should hold the Ministry alone responsible for it! Its causes are multiple and all of them are not under its control. But what I blame the Ministry for is not seeing the situation or, if they see it, for not having the courage to face it.

I was disappointed yesterday on hearing the Speech from the Throne. His Excellency had done us the honor to summon us for the despatch of business; we come, we listen with respectful attention, and we find that the only busness which his Excellency invites us to despatch is... what? to congratulate the Government on the happy labors of the last Parliament; and that's all. Not one measure proposed; not one reform suggested.

Yes, I repeat, I was grievously disappointed: I had expected that the Ministry had studied the situation and that it would indicate both the source of the ill and the remedy.

THE PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF THE EVIL

from which we suffer is that thus far that the production of this country is not equal to the consumption. The Ministry might all the more easily have admitted this, seeing that it does not alone bear the responsibility, which weighs upon the entire nation.

It is a humiliating confession to make that, after three centuries of existence, this country is still unable to supply its own wants and that it is still obliged to have recourse to foreign markets, though nature has lavished upon it all the gifts necessary to render it a manufacturing country.

It is now, Sir, a good many years since the great patriot, whom we recently lost, Honorable L. J. Papineau, casting about for a remedy for the ills of the time, summed up his policy on the subject in this simple precept: "We should buy nothing from the metropolis." My opinion is that this policy is even more urgent to-day than it was when first formulated.

It is a duty, especially for us Canadians of French origin, to create.

A NATIONAL INDUSTRY

We are surrounded by a strong and vigorous race, who are endowed with a devouring activity and have taken possession of the entire universe as their field of labor.

As a French Canadian, Sir, I am pained to see my people eternally excelled by our fellow countrymen of British origin. We must frankly acknowledge that down to the present we have been left behind in the race. We can admit this and admit it without shame, because the fact is explained by purely political reasons which denote no inferiority on our part. After the conquest, the Canadians, desirous of maintaining their national inheritance intact, fell back upon themselves, and kept up no relations with the outside world. The immediate result of this policy was to keep them strangers to the reforms which were constantly taking place beyond their boundaries and to fatally shut them up within the narrow circle of their own old theories. On the other hand, the new blood, which was poured into the colony, came from the most advanced country under the sun in point of trade and industry. They brought with them the civilization of their native land and their strength was ceaselessly renewed by a constant current of immigration, which added not only to their numbers, but to their stock of information and their ideas. We need therefore have no shame in admitting that we were beaten by such men and under such circumstances.

BUT THE TIMES ARE CHANGED

and the hour has struck to enter the lists with them. Our respective forefathers were enemies and waged bloody war against each other for centuries. But we, their descendants, united under the same flag, fight no other fights but those of a generous emulation to excel each other in trade and industry, in the sciences and the arts of peace.

I have already stated that the Government of the Province of Quebec is not alone responsible for the stagnation of our industry. It is sufficient to say that alone it can neither create nor develop it, but it can contribute powerfully thereto.

BY THE KIND OF IMMIGRATION

which it introduces into the country. Thus far it seems to me that the Government has been moving in the wrong direction. The Government has devoted itself to recruiting an exclusively agricultural immigration—its efforts will end in nothing. The agricultural population of this country will never be increased from outside. Our climate is too severe and the development of our lands too costly and difficult. The children of the soil will not be deterred by these obstacles; but the stranger will simply pass through our territory and locate on the rich prairies of the west. Moreover, wherever our agents set their foot, they find themselves forestalled by American agents, by American books and pamphlets, and, above all, by American prestige.

We can, however, introduce here with good results, I think,

AN INDUSTRIAL IMMIGRATION.

I do not mean simple workmen, but master mechanics and small capitalists such as are to be found in all the cities of Europe. The inducement, which

would lead them to invest their labor and their capital in our midst is that we can produce 25 per cent cheaper than any other part of the American continent—what we need is the master-miners of Wales and the north of England, the mechanics of Alsace, the Flemish weavers and the German artisans of all kinds.

Such an immigration, it seems to me, would give an extraordinary impulse to our industry.

In addition to this purely economic question, there are political reforms which we hoped to have seen announced in the Speech from the Throne. Among these reforms, there are two, which have been urgently demanded by public opinion for a long time past, in our election law and in education.

OUR ELECTION LAW

is deplorably behind that of the other provinces and even of the Dominion. Public opinion has long demanded a law modelled on that of Ontario, where the elections are all held on the same day. Our law has opened the door to lamentable abuses and to the direct intervention of the Governement in the exercise of the popular suffrage. At the last elections, the Government was thus enabled to first issue the writs for such of the counties as it considered safe, and afterwards, thanks to this tactic, to bring all its strength to the assistance of its friends whom it deemed in danger. Such conduct is an abuse. If we are a free people, the popular suffrage must be freely exercised and the exact expression of the popular will must be secured.

I shall only refer incidentally to the question of

EDUCATION,

upon which we have been long and are still waiting for the Premier's action.

When the hon. Premier assumed the reins of power in 1867, he had been for twelve years Superintendent of Education and had just returned from a

trip to Europe undertaken for the express purpose of studying on the spot the different educational systems of the Old World. It was our hope that, on his return, he would have embodied in legislation the results of his observations and experience. But for the last four years like Sister Anne on the tower top, we have been looking for something to come, but it has not yet appeared.

I have heard it said elswhere : " But what is the good of these reforms ? Will they increase the public wealth ? Will they enhance in the slightest degree the prosperity of the country ? " Sir, in a free state, every thing is connected and linked together legislation, trade, industry, arts, sciences and letters, all are members of a same body, the body social. When one of the members suffers, the entire body is affected ; when there is an abuse anywhere, the entire body social is more or less paralyzed ; when there is anywhere something left undone which should be done, the normal order is thereby disturbed.

England has become great because she has thoroughly understood this principle. No question there has ever been allowed to languish. No sooner has an abuse been noted and a reform demanded, than the Governement of the day, whatever it might be, Whig or Tory, has at once given the subject attention and taken the initiative, never dropping it until the abuse has been destroyed and the reform accomplished.

We, on the contrary, only know how to pander to our own prejudices and our self-love ; we never have the courage to admit that we are not perfect or that there is anything we should do.

I grant, Sir, that, underyling this conduct, there may be a thought or rather an excess of patriotic affection. But this is far from being a proper patriotism and it is certainly not mine. My patriotism consists rather in telling my country hard truths, which will help to arouse it from its lethargy and to direct it at last into the path of true progress and true prosperity.

ABOLITION OF DUAL REPRESENTATION

MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH ON THAT QUESTION

DELIVERED ON THE 24TH NOVEMBER, 1871

IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

In the early days of the session of 1871, the evil of dual representation, now fully recognized and admitted by both parties, was again made the subject of attack by the Opposition in the Quebec Legislature. Hon. F. G. Marchand, then and still member for St. John's, brought in a bill to abolish it, which the Government of the day only succeeded in getting rejected by the narrow majority of 5 votes—the division being 34 to 29. Mr. Laurier took part in this memorable debate, once more winning general admiration for his graceful eloquence and contributing in no slight degree by his close and powerful reasoning to hasten the abolition, which took place not long afterwards, of a system fraught with the greatest danger to the best interests of the Province. Even *L'Evenement*, then a Conservative organ, was forced to admit next day that Mr. Laurier's effort on this occasion was remarkable both in form and substance and superior even to his utterance on the Address. It is that speech, of which we now propose to reproduce a translation:

MR. SPEAKER,

The line of conduct adopted by the Government on this question fully warrants the reproach I addressed to it not long since, of being afraid to face the situation of the country squarely

If to-day I reiterate that reproach, it is not because I am actuated by any hostile feeling towards the Government, nor is it because I wish to offer it a systematic and unfair opposition; but because I cannot lose sight of the fact that I here form part of the people's jury and that, on every question that comes up, it is my duty to render a consciencious verdict regardless of person or party.

If to-day I reiterate that reproach, it is because it is impossible for me to be satisfied with the Government's policy on this occasion, and I believe that it is equally impossible for all, who rise above party considerations, to be satisfied with a

POLICY OF RETICENCE AND PROCRASTINATION

which evades and does not solve the questions of the hour.

What I expected and had a right to expect from the Government, Sir, was not that it should share my opinion but that it should have an opinion of its own on this question. Unfortunately, it has none. The hon. Premier told us that this is the ninth time he has discussed this question both here and at Ottawa. This is quite true and yet thus far we have not been able to learn what the Premier thinks of the principle laid down by the bill of the hon. member from St. John's. I repeat, Sir, that we had a right to look for something different from the Government.

Here we have a question of constitutional law of the highest importance, a question intimately connected with the working of our political system, demanding solution. The Government is asked to declare whether the principle embodied in the bill is right and, if so, to adopt it or to declare whether it is false and in that case to reject it, but what does the Government do? Neither the one nor the other. It washes its hands of the question and leaves it to the people.

The only reason given by the hon. Premier for

not adopting the measure is that it would be an encroachment on the electoral liberties of the people

I am astonished, Sir, at so much condescension for the majesty of the people in a Conservative Government, which has always made such a parade of its Conservative principles in the press and on the hustings.

To leave the application of the most delicate questions of constitutional law eternally open to the fluctuations, undulations and caprices of public opinion is hardly to my mind a Conservative principle. Neither is it a Liberal principle. I am inclined rather to consider it as a subversive principle fraught with disappointments and dangers, the entire bearing of which has not been calculated.

It is undoubledly commendable to assert, to proclaim, to defend the rights and prerogatives of the people; and, on this point I yield to no one, as there is nobody in this House who has a deeper respect than I have for the rights and prerogatives of the people or who regards it more as a duty to jealously watch and protect the sacred trust.

But, among those rights and prerogatives, I do not recognize the privilege to bring forever into question the principles which are the logical and natural consequence of our constitution. These principles are sacred and inviolable and should be kept safe from the storms of our daily political life.

THE LIBERTY OF THE PEOPLE

is not unbounded; its natural boundaries are the rights of society.

If man were a perfect being, if his notions of right and wrong were always so clear and so luminous that all aberration on his part was impossible, then, Sir, I should say: leave to the people absolute liberty: allow them, without laying down any rule for them, to choose for themselves, in each isolated case, the principles that should guide their conduct;

in fine, under such circumstances, leave them perfectly free to elect their representatives as they please, without placing any restriction on their choice.

But, if such were the case, if such were the happy condition of humanity, we would have no need either of constitution or of laws.

For, why have we a constitution?

WHY HAVE WE LAWS?

Precisely, to determine the principles which the people should follow in the exercise of their rights—to fix on the one hand the extent of the rights of the people and, on the other, the extent of the rights of society.

When a people accept a constitution, they make the sacrifice of a portion of their liberty, a generous sacrifice by which each one gives up something belonging to himself individually for the benefit and security of the whole.

When a people accept a constitution, they trace out themselves the circle which they assign to their liberties; they say to themselves in a sense: this space belongs to me; here I can speak, think, act; I owe no account of my words, my thoughts, my acts to any one except to my own conscience and to God; but, as regards society, here begins its domain and ends mine and I shall not go further.

Still, like all human works, constitutions are not perfect. New horizons, which were not before perceived, are constantly opening up and unsuspected abuses are discovered. It is then

THE DUTY OF THE LEGISLATURE

to step in and to enlarge or contract, according to needs and circumstances, the circle within which the institutions of the country move.

To-day, the member for St John's points out one of these abuses. The member for St John's indicates

as an abuse the eligibility to this House of members of the Federal Legislature. He contends that this right of eligibility is a flagrant contradiction.

AN ANOMALY,

as regards the great principle of our constitution, the federative principle; he contends that from this anomaly, this contradiction, may spring grave complications, real dangers, which should be prevented, if we do not want to have to suppress them later on.

The Ministry, on the other hand, seems to make it a scruple to touch, even by a hair's breadth, what it complaisantly terms the liberty of the people.

The Ministry forgets that there are principles of eternal and immutable truth that a people can never be permitted to violate with impunity; it forgets that it appertains to principles less striking, less evident, perhaps, but not less certain, which are the logical consequence of our adopted form of government and which should be equally sacred; it forgets, in fine, that the freedom of election must be necessarily limited in certain points and that a people cannot be permitted to choose its representatives from among all classes of citizens. As it is, there are several classes of citizens, who are, by law.

INELIGIBLE;

for one, I need only mention the judges. Will the Ministry pretend that the people, if they took the fancy, would be free to send a judge to sit in this House? No; it is a principle admitted by all civilized nations that the man charged with the administration of justice, calm and dispassionate justice, should not be mixed up with the storms of political life.

The member for St John's asserts as an equally certain principle that the entry to this House should be forbidden to members of the Federal Legislature

AS IT IS TO THE JUDGES.

This, Sir, is the question to be decided. It will not do to answer it by dilatory exceptions, as the Government is doing. If, to-morrow, a member were to rise and propose that the judges should be eligible, what would the Government do? Would it say, as it is saying to day: We do not wish to touch the liberty of the people. I shall carry the hypothesis further:

There is to day in the United States a number of public writers who claim for the fair sex what they term the *privileges* and what I shall call the burthens of the.....the.....well the ugly sex; who claim for the *women* not only the right to vote, the right of eligibility, the right not only to send members to Parliament, but, to sit in it themselves. Sir, we are a colony of England and we are also neighbors of the United States; it does not need so much to make it probable that sooner or later these theories of feminine emancipation will penetrate into our own midst. If then some member, incited by an excess of radicalism or gallantry, (extremes meet), were to rise and move to throw open to women the doors of this House, I do not mean the doors of the galleries, but the doors of the Quebec Legislature itself, what would the Government do if it was still in power? Would it say as it says to day: we do not wish to touch the liberty of the people? Would it say: if the people choose to send us female colleagues, we accept them?

The chivalrous feelings of the Ministry are well known to me, Sir, but I also know their Conservative principles. Now, between their feelings and their principles, which would carry the day? No answer is needed. The Ministry would not hesitate to limit on this point that liberty of the people for which it to-day professes to have *such* a tremendously high respect. Well, the attitude which the Ministry would take on that occasion, let them take it to-day. If the principle laid down in the bill is right, let them say so and accept it; if it is wrong, let them say so and reject it; but let them not in the name of liberty .

TRY TO ELUDE THE SITUATION

I am a friend to liberty, but with me liberty does not mean license. A free people is not one without laws or checks; a free people is one among whom all the attributes, all the rights of the members of the State are clearly defined and determined and among whom there is no encroachment of one power upon another. That is the *true* liberty.

Once more, I ask, is the principle laid down in the bill of the honorable member for St John's right or is it not? I, for one, do not hesitate to say that what we are agreed to term dual representation, the double mandate, is altogether *incompatible with the principle of our constitution*, with the federative principle.

A confederation is a bundle of states, which have a community of general interests, but which have nevertheless towards each other local interests distinct and separate.

For all their common interests and common wants, these states have a common legislature, the Federal Legislature, but for all their local interests, they have each a local and separate legislature.

Within the respective domains of their attributes, the legislatures, as well Local as Federal, are sovereign and independent of each other.

Now, in order that the federative system may not be an empty term, in order that in may yield the results it is expected to produce, the legislatures must be

INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER

not only in law, but in fact; the Local Legislature especially must be completely protected against all control by the Federal Legislature. If, immediately or remotely, the Federal Legislature exercises the slightest control over the Local Legislature, then you have no longer a federative union; but a legislative

union under a federative form. If you throw open the doors of this House, to the members of the Federal Legislature you admit by the very fact the control of this House by the Federal Legislature and then, as I have said, you destroy the federative union, of which, it is true, you may retain the form, but have no longer the substance. The thing, moreover, is easily explained.

By the very fact that we are an independent state, forming part of another independent state, we are bound to have business relations with that state. Such, Sir, is the condition of human things that, wherever there are business relations, there are also conflicts and

COMPLICATIONS OF INTERESTS.

We cannot escape the common fate. A day will come when these conflicts, these complications of interests, will arise between the Government of Quebec and the Federal Government. Naturally, the Federal Legislature will side with the Federal Government and the Local Legislature with the Local Government. If, under these circumstances, you open the doors of this House to the members of the Federal Legislature, will you not, by this fact alone, introduce into this House an element necessarily hostile to the province and necessarily bound to take sides against it? Do you think that, in entering this House, the Federal members will cease to be Federal members? Do you imagine that, on entering here, they will leave behind them at the threshold their interests and their sentiments? Do you believe that after pleading Ottawa's case at Ottawa, they will plead Quebec's case at Quebec? Do you think that they will burn here what they adored at Ottawa and that they will adore here what they burned at Ottawa? Mistake! mistake! the Federal members will remain Federal members, if it be true that no man can serve two masters; they will plead Ottawa's cause

at Quebec against Quebec and they will support their arguments with all the weight of their influence. And then what will be Quebec's fate ? Quebec's fate will be

THE FATE OF THE EARTHEN POT

which, one day, took it into its head to travel in company with the iron pot: Quebec will be crushed.

What I have just stated, Sir, is not mere hypothesis. I support my argument with the authority of the honorable member for Montmorency, member for Montmorency at Quebec and President of the Senate at Ottawa.

No later than in the debate on the arbitration, the honorable member for Montmorency (Mr Cauchon)—if I remember his words rightly—said, in defending the conduct of the honorable Premier, that the same member may have certain duties at Quebec and others at Ottawa on the same question. These words, Sir, are stricly true and, from this very moment, is not the question decided ? What ? Are we going to expose the same man to the necessity of speaking and acting in self-contradiction according as he sits

AT QUEBEC OR AT OTTAWA ?

I will go further and, by this same question of the arbitration, show the disastrous results which the double mandate might produce.

The debate on the arbitration has brought out this fact – that both sides of the House are agreed in looking upon the decision of the Provincial arbitrators as a glaring iniquity and that we must at all costs extricate ourselves from the position in which that decision involves us. Where we differ is only upon the means to be taken to get out of that position. Fortunately for us, the Federal Government has suspended the execution of the sentence. I fancy, Sir, that it was not without difficulty and without hesi-

tation that the Federal Government came to the conclusion to adopt this line of conduct. I will suppose (which by the way is altogether impossible) that the Federal Government, either from fear of putting the Confederation in danger by acting otherwise or for any other reason, had elected to enforce the sentence, there would have been an immense cry of indignation from the entire province of Quebec. I have no doubt that the Government of Quebec would have not delayed an instant in casting about for means to deliver us from the iniquitous sentence. I am satisfied that it would have immediately called the Legislature together to submit some proposal on the subject. Sir, I see in the House two members of the Federal Government. What would they have done then? Would they have repudiated what they had approved at Ottawa? Would they have said at Quebec: do not execute the sentence, after having said at Ottawa: execute it? Alas! it is certain that they could not have acted otherwise than consistently with themselves; they could not have helped using the same language here as at Ottawa and what they would have said to us here would have been in substance and without ambiguity: Submit!

SUBMIT TO THE INIQUITY.

and do you think that these words would have been empty. Sir, each one can think of them as he pleases, but my firm conviction is that their influence would have been all powerful and that Quebec's interests would have been sacrificed without pity to save the interests of the Federal Ministers.

But this is not all. The honorable member for Lotbinière, (Mr. Joly) stated only a short time since, in the course of the debate on the address, that if the legislative form was not adopted at the time of the union of the British colonies, it was on account of the particular situation and

THE EXCEPTIONAL INTERESTS OF QUEBEC.

These words were not contradicted and they could not, as it is a historical fact that the federative form was only adopted to preserve for Quebec the exceptional and unique position which it occupied on the American continent. That position, Sir, I am anxious to maintain intact and I say with the poet

Mon verre n'est pas grand, mais je bois dans mon verre.
(My glass is not big, but I drink from my glass)

With the single mandate, I have the guarantee that Quebec's rights and privileges will be preserved and respected and that its position will be maintained; while, with the double mandate, those rights and privileges seem to me to be in perpetual danger.

Lastly, Sir, I shall speak my whole mind: with the single mandate, Quebec is Quebec; with the double mandate, it only becomes an appendix to Ottawa.

LOUIS RIEL IN THE COMMONS

PLEA AGAINST HIS EXPULSION FROM THE HOUSE

(*HOUSE OF COMMONS*)

SITTING OF THE 15TH APRIL, 1874

Returned for Provencher in October, 1873, Louis Riel had been re-elected for the same county at the general elections by which the Mackenzie Administration were maintained in office after Sir John A Macdonald's resignation on the Pacific Scandal. The presence of the Metis leader in the Federal capital, the audacity which he had displayed in presenting himself before the Clerk of the House to be sworn in as a member and the uncertainty as to whether he would take his seat or be arrested, all combined to create and extraordinary degree of excitement. Nevertheless the entire point at-issue summed itself up in the question : had he been amnes tied? On the 9th March, 1870, Mgr Taché, on the part of both the Federal and Imperial Governments, promised pardon to Riel in particular and had given him the assurance of a complete amnesty, covering the murder of Thomas Scott, and, on the 17th June of the same year, Father Ritchot, Judge Black and Mr Scott assured Mgr Taché that a full and entire amnesty had been promised by the Governor General and by Sir Clinton Murdoch in Her Masjesty's name; while on the 12th July Sir George Etienne Cartier wrote to Mgr Taché to confirm the promise of an amnesty. In 1874, the House of Commons found itself confronted with three motions: one by Mr McKenzie Bowell, demanding the immediate expulsion of the member for Provencher; the second, by the late Mr Holton, proposing to defer any decision until the Committee had reported on the existence of a promise of amnesty, and the third by the late Mr Mousseau, granting the amnesty then and there. Mr Laurier declared in favor of the Holton amendment:

MR SPEAKER

Altongh this debate has been prolonged beyond the limits of human patience, I shall nevertheless take the liberty of putting the indulgence of the House to the test. At first, it was not my intention to take part in this discussion, but it has taken such an unexpected turn that it seems to me that I would not properly do my duty towards myself and towards my constituents if I contented myself with giving a silent vote.

I have listened, Sir, with the greatest attention to all the arguments which have been advanced in support of the main motion, and, although some of these arguments have been urged by men whose opinion I greatly respect, I must frankly admit that I have found it impossible to be convinced by them; I have not been convinced that, at the point reached by the proceedings taken against the member for Provencher (Mr Riel) and with all that has been proved thus far against him, we would be justified or have the right to expel him.

The conclusion to which, in my opinion, the House should come is that, there have been too many facts raked out of oblivion and laid to the charge of the member for Provencher to permit of his being absolved; it is not the less true that too many other facts have been overlooked to warrant his expulsion. Which means to say that I shall vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Chateauguay, (Mr Holton) the wise amendment which has been supported with so much skill, eloquence and gallantry by the honorable member for South Ontario (Mr. Cameron)

But, before going futher, I must apologize to the House for using a language with which I am only imperfectly acquainted; really, I should claim a complete amnesty, because I know only too surely that, in the course of the few remarks I wish to make, I shall frequently murder the Queen's English.

I am perfectly conscious of the disagreable task

which I impose on the House when I force it to listen to a man so unfamiliar with the language he uses, but I can assure you that if it is a task for the House, it is much more disagreeable for myself. I am so convinced, so thoroughly convinced, that the adoption of the honorable member for Chateauguay's amendment is the only course that the House should pursue that I consider that I would be guilty of an act of cowardice if, for any motive whatever, I allowed myself to be turned away from the defence of the opinions which I regard as the soundest and safe t on this subject.

As I have already stated, I would not have had the presumption to take part in this debate, but I think that I am warranted in intervening, because it seems that the true question before the House has not been treated. Many secondary considerations have been raised, but the real question has not been touched.

The question has been treated as if the facts on which the main motion is based had been proven and proven beyong all doubt. Now, I maintain that the facts alleged in the motion have not been established in a way to warrant this House in voting the expulsion.

I desire to state at once that I have no side taken on the question now before us against the member for Provencher. I have not the slightest prevention and, on the other hand, I have no predisposition whatever in his favor.

I have never spoken to him; I have never seen him; I have never had any relations with him either directly or indirectly. He belongs to no political party and between him and me there is no bond of sympathy; I am as impartial as if I was in the jury box.

And we should all act as if we were jurors, because the functions we exercise at this moment are judicial functions. It is quite true that the object in view is to protect the honor and purity of this House; but it is equally true that the effect might be to deprive

one of our fellow citizens of what rightfully belongs to him, to strip the member for Provencher of his title and privileges as a member of this House, and to rob the county of Provencher of the services of the man whom it has chosen as its representative. I maintain that we are excercising judicial functions and, without going forther, I base this opinion on the words uttered by Lord Granville in the English House of Commons in 1807. A similar case to this one was in question, and the opinion referred to was later on quoted approvingly by the Attorney General for Ireland in the celebrated Saddlier affair already so many times cited in the course of this debate.

Here is what he said:

> We are now acting in our judicial capacity and we are consequently obliged to base the judgment we are about to render not on our desires or prepossessions, but on specific facts alleged and proved according to the ordinary rules of our procedure.

This opinion of Lord Granville's, corroborated and approved as it was by the Attorney General for Ireland, in the Saddlier affair, gives us the true basis on which we should regulate our decisions and confirms in a conclusive manner my contention that we are exercising judicial functions and that we should follow

THE RULES OF JUDICIAL PROOF.

This point being established beyond all doubt, let us examine the facts that have been alleged and those that have been proven:

The honorable member for North Hastings (Mr Bowell) has based his motion on three facts. He asserts: 1° That Louis Riel, member for Provencher, was indicted before the Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba, in the month of November last, for the murder of Thomas Scott and that a *true bill* was returned against him; 2° That thereupon a warrant

was issued for his arrest, but that, since that time, he has systematically eluded justice and that he is consequently contumacious; 3° That he disobeyed the order of this House, commanding him to appear in his seat on the day fixed

I contest the honorable member for North Hasting's first assertion and I maintain that there is not a shadow of proof that an indictment was laid against the member for Provencher and that a *true bill* was returned against him; I mean to say that there does not exist the slightest judicial proof which would justify this House in taking action. There was only one way to prove this precise fact—it was by producing the *indictment*, but nothing of the sort has been done.

Singular to say, too—in the evidence given by the Attorney General of Manitoba,—there is not one word to prove that an *indictment* was returned against the member for Provencher. I will take the liberty of referring the House to the evidence of the Attorney General, at page 16 of the Votes and Proceedings:

QUESTION:—Did an indictment of Louis Riel take place before the Court of Queen's Bench, in Manitoba?

ANSWER:—At the *extra* term of the Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba, in November last, Louis Riel was indicted.

And that's all. There is not a word to indicate that a *true bill* was returned. If I make this remark, it is not because I attach any great importance to this omission, for, from my point of view, the indictment could not be proven except by the production of the document itself or of a certified copy of it.

I have made this remark for the sole purpose of showing how weak is the proof, even from the most favorable point of view as regards the motion. But it will be said, perhaps, that we have ample proof that a *true bill* was returned, in the warrant which was issued against Mr. Riel and which has been produced. This argument cannot be accepted.

I will remind the House once more that we are exercising judicial functions and that we should be

guided entirely by the rules of judicial proof. Is the rule admitted by Lord Granville when the question was to deprive a man of his property not just enough that we should obscure it in the present case?

Wherefore I again insist on the necessity, the absolute necessity, of deciding this question according to the rules of judicial proof and not otherwise.

The first of these rules is that, when the best proof can be furnished, secondary evidence

IS NEVER ADMITTED

Now, I note that this principle, which I have just laid down has been admitted and recognized by the honorable member for North-Hastings himself.

In fact why did he bring the Attorney General of Manitoba to the bar of the House?

Simply, to get official judicial proof regarding the charges which he has made against the member for Provencher.

It was not to bring any new facts to the knowledge of the members of this House. We are acquainted with all the unfortunate events that have occurred in Manitoba before and since the entry of that province into the Confederation.

Every one of us knows these facts as well as the Attorney General of Manitoba himself and when he appeared at the bar, not a single member learned a fact that he had not previously known.

Why then did the honorable member for North Hastings bring here the Attorney General of Manitoba and get him to repeat what we already knew as well as the witness?

It was because he admitted and recognized the principle which I am defending at this moment. It was because he recognized the fact that the complete knowledge which each of us possessed was not sufficient to permit the House of Commons to act; because he recognized that we are exercising judicial

functions and that it was essential for him to establish judicially and by the best evidence the charges he has made against the member for Provencher.

Since he admits this principle, he should be consistent and furnish literal proof of his charges; but in this he has completely failed.

He was bound to produce an *indictment*, but he has failed in this duty and I can safely conclude that there is

NO PROOF

that the member for Provencher was *indicted* and that a *true bill* was found against him.

It will be argued, perhaps, that the reasons which I advance are pure legal subtleties. Name them as you please, technical expressions, legal subtleties, it matters little; for my part, I say that these technical reasons, these legal subtleties, are the guarantees of British liberty.

Thanks to these technical expressions, these legal subtleties, no person on British soil can be arbitrarily deprived of what belongs to him. There was a time whe the procedure was much simpler than it is today, when the will alone of one man was sufficient to deprive another man of his liberty, his property, his honor and all that makes life dear.

But, since the days of the Great Charter, never has it been possible on British "soil" to rob a man of his liberty, his property or his honor except under the safeguard of what has been termed in this debate technical expressions and legal subtleties.

It will be further objected, perhaps, that the admission of this principle will have the effect of preventing this House from reaching a man accused of an abominable crime.

This objection simply evades the question, for the point which remains to be decided is whether it is true that such a charge exists against the member for Provencher. I maintain that, as long as we have not before us the literal proof, we have no proof.

It is perfectly true that in matters of this kind, we exercise

A SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY.

No power can alter what we shall do, no matter how unjust or arbitrary it may be. We can, if we like, take no account of the precedents cited for our guidance, pay no attention to the sacred laws established for the protection of the citizen, act upon incomplete evideuce or upon none at all, but will we do so?

We undoubledly have the power, but have we the right to arbitrarily set aside the rules which constituts the security of society and of the citizen? If the House forgets this to day, it may perhaps, obtain a temporary satisfaction, but it will create a precedent which will be a perpetual danger for our constitution and which in the future will serve as a pretext for more crying acts of injustice.

I submit to the consideration of the House that he who has to apply the law should not try to show himself wiser than the law. I submit that there is no practice more dangerous than to try to violate the law to obtain any result, no matter how desirable it may be.

I will be further told, perhaps, that these are lawyer's objection. This remark may have some force, but what is still more forcible is that these objections command the respect of every man who respects the laws of his country.

I repeat that these objections are

NOT MERE SUBTLETIES.

While we have not the indictment here before as, we have only an incomplete proof, a part of the proof.

If we had had the indictment, we might have crossquestioned the Attorney General and then we would have succeeded in bringing out an important

fact, namely, that that *indictment* was obtained by a conspiracy between the Attorney General and a packed jury

In any case, we could have crossquestioned the Attorney General in regard to

HIS STRANGE CONDUCT.

We would have learned how it was that he, with zeal enough to turn simple constable with a bench warrant in his pocket, did not seek before today to capture the man whom he calls a murderer; how it was that to that man, whom he now calls a murderer, he for years applied the title of friend.

Now, we cannot crossquestion the witness on these important points, while we have not before us the proof of the principal fact, which would have opened the door to important developments.

Mr Speaker, nobody has forgotten that the honorable member for North Hastings, in making his motion, laid stress chiefly on the precedent furnished by the English House of Commons in the Saddlier case.

That precedent, I accept not only on this, but on all the other points, and I will call the attention of the honorable member to one thing, which was that the first step taken against Saddlier was to prove the *indictment* found against him, by laying on the table an authentic copy of the same.

I now pass to the second allegation of the motion of the honorable member for North Hastings, which states that the member for Provencher has systematically eluded the pursuit of justice and that he is at present guilty of contempt.

If there is no proof before the House of an indictment against the member for Provencher, it is impossible, legally speaking, to pretend that he is a fugitive from justice and this, of itself, is enough to destroy the assertion of the member for North Hastings.

Without, however, adopting this, perhaps, extreme way of looking at it, let us face and examine the question squarely: is the member for Provercher

a fugitive from justice or is he not? Is he or is he not contumacious?

I have already repeated that we have no legal proof of an indictment; it is true that we have before us that a bench warrant was issued by the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba against the member for Provencher and that so far that warrant has not been executed. This is all the proof before this House in support of the motion of the honorable member for North Hastings. Well, I do not hesitate to say that, in law as well as in justice and equity, it cannot be concluded from this simple fact that the member for Provencher can at this present hour be

CONSIDERED AS CONTUMACIOUS.

In point of fact, that warrant was issued at the term of November last. Now there is nothing very extraordinary in the fact that it could not be executed in time to bring the accused before the court before the close of the term; the member for Provencher might have been absent from Manitoba at that period. It is notorious that, since the unfortunate events of 1869-70, he has almost constantly resided abroad. It is very possible that the news of his indictment may not have reached him until after the close of the term. But, it may be said, why did he not give himself up then? Simply because it was better for him to remain at liberty until the next term. If he had given himself up at once, he would have been obliged to remain a prisoner for six or seven months, perhaps, awaiting his trial.

Who can say, however, that he will not appear even tomorrow before the court, if it required his presence tomorrow? Who can say that he will not eagerly seize the occasion to stand his trial if that occasion be given him?

But I hear it said: there was quite recently a term of the court and he did not give himself up to answer to the charge standing against him.

Sir, this object is worthless, because if you pretend

that the court has sat, then where are the proceedings which have been taken to establish that he is a fugitive from justice? Where is the report of the sheriff of the province attesting that he tried to execute the warrant issued against the member for Provencher, but that he could not succeed in doing so?

In the face of this proof or rather of this absence of proof, where is the English subject, with respect for English law, who will dare to rise in this House and maintain that the member for Provencher is contumacious?

But there is more than all this. The member for Provencher has always asserted that the old Administration had

PROMISED HIM AN AMNESTY

for all the acts in which he had taken part in Manitoba prior to the admission of that province into the Confederation. He has reiterated this assertion twenty times, perhaps. His friends have made the same assertion and the old Administration has never been willing to speak out on the subject. Called upon over and over again to declare what there was in this alleged promise of amnesty, to state simply yes or no, it has never been willing to say yes or no.

I regard this obstinate silence of the old Administration as an absolute confirmation of the pretension of Mr Riel and his friends—it is a case of "silence giving consent."

Well, if this be the case, if the member for Provencher was promised an amnesty for all the acts which he may have committed in Manitsba while at the head of the provisional government, is it surprising that he should not want to submit to those who now wish to drag him before the courts for those same acts? Is he not warranted in so acting? Is he not right in so doing in order that the promise of amnesty made to him, in the Queen's name, may be carried out?

Who can say that, under the circumstances, he is a fugitive from justice, that he is contumacious?

No, Sir, as long as this question of the amnesty has not been cleared up I, for one, shall never declare that this man is a fugitive from his country's justice. Moreover, this question will be soon elucidated. as no later than last week we named a committee to enquire into it. This committee is sitting at this moment and the House, in my opinion, would do not only a culpable, but an illogical and inconsistent act, if it came to any decision affecting this question from near or far, until it has received

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

In addition, Sir, from the legal point of view alone, at the stage reached by the proceedings taken against the member for Provencher before the Court of Queen's Bench, in Manitoba, it is impossible to say that he is contumacious.

I have already stated that I was ready, in all respects, to follow the rules laid down by the House of Commons in the Saddlier affair; now, the principal rule adopted in that affair is that a man cannot be declared guilty of contempt unless all the opportunities of standing his trial have been exhausted and that he has not sought to take advantage of them.

When the Saddlier affair came up for the first time before the House of Commons the motion for expulsion was rejected, because Saddlier could still come before the court to stand his trial and because it would have been premature to declare him contumacious.

The Attorney General for Ireland said on the subject " that, if he had an advice to give to the House, he would recommend it to let the motion stand over until the next session; in the interval, the proceedings begun would be continued and Mr Saddlier would be brought before the court and stand his trial or he would be outlawed."

The House of Commons adopted this wise suggestion and, as I have already had the honor to state, the motion of expulsion was rejected on that occasion.

There, Sir, is an example already traced out for us: for my part, as I have already remarked, I am ready to follow it in all respects. I do not know whether the honorable member for North Hastings is prepared to say as much.

I come now to the third point of the motion; that the honorable member for Provencher has disobeyed the order of this House commanding him to appear in his seat on a fixed day.

I maintain that this fact does not exist. The member for Provencher could not disobey, for the simple reason that he could not have regularly had knowledge of this order, since it was

NEVER SIGNIFIED TO HIM.

Mr. Bowell.—Hear, hear

Mr. Laurier.—I hear the honorable member for North Hastings cry: "hear hear!" Well, I again refer the honorable member to the Saddlier precedent upon which he claims to rest his case and which nevertheless he is always forgetting. He will see there that the House of Commons had caused to be served on Saddlier the order commanding him to appear in his seat and that it had sent one of its messengers expressly to Ireland for the purpose. I again quote the words of the Attorney General:

He could inform the House that on Monday last one of its messengers had gone to Ireland and, on the next day, had served upon Mr Saddlier, at his domicile in the county Tipperary, the order commanding him to be in his seat: that, on the same day, he had left a copy of the order at a house in Dublin, in which Mr Saddlier had formerly resided, and that he had left another copy with Mr Saddlier's lawyers.

I now expect to hear the honorable member for North Hastings tell us that it was useless to try to serve the order of the House on the member for Provencher, since nobody knows where he is at this moment. But, if it was impossible to serve the order

personally on the member for Provencher, it was easy to have served it at his domicile, as in the Saddlier affair. Is there not an absolute similarity between the two cases? And look at the minute precautions taken by the English House of Commons to notify Saddlier and to call upon him to defend himself against the motion of expulsion!

Here, nothing of the same kind has been down, absolutely nothing. I therefore contend—and I defy contradiction on this point—that the House cannot take into consideration the motion of the honorable member for North Hastings as long as it has not served on the member for Provencher the order commanding him to appear in his seat, as long as it has not

CHALLENGED HIM

to defend himself.

For it is the privilege, the right, in fact, of every British subject that he shall be stripped of nothing which belongs to him, without first being called upon to defend himself.

But it will be said, perhaps, on the other side of the House: What is the good of all these purely abstract objections? What purpose would it serve to notify the the member for Provencher of the motion to be made against him? Are not all the facts charged against him true? Is he not guilty?

Even though he were the greatest culprit in the world, the law should be followed and respected. Even though he might not have a word to say in his own defence, he should not the less be notified. The fundamental principle of all justice is that nobody shall ever be condemned, without having been heard in his own defence or without having been called upon to defend himself. In numerous cases, decisions, just in themselves and perfectly equitable, have been reversed by the higher courts in England, solely because the party condemned had not been notified to defend himself.

I may be permetted to here cite the language of Judge Bailey in a case reported in volume 12 of the *Law and Equity Reports*, p. 242:

> I know of no case, he said, in which a power exercising judicial functions can deprive a man of any fraction whatever of his property, without his having been previously called upon to present his defence. He who decides a case without having heard the other side, has not done what is just, even though his decision should be just

As for me, Sir, I am of French origin and my education has been French, but I have this of the Briton in me: an ardent love of fair play and of justice.

Now, I assert—and nobody can contradict me—that the member for Provencher has not on this occasion had either justice or fair play. The House is asked to come to an unjust and illegal decision; but, for my part, I shall never consent, in this instance or any other, to deprive a man of the smallest particle of his rights or property without first having given him the benefit of all the legal forms to defend himself.

I therefore believe that, on this point as on the preceding ones, I can conclude in all safety that the allegations on which rests the motion of the honorable member for North Hastings are not supported by sufficient proof.

These reasons are certainly conclusive in favor of the amendment of the member for Chateauguay.

To that amendment, my honorable friend, the member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) has proposed a sub-amendment, demanding purely and simply an amnesty on the spot, without waiting for the report of the committee of enquiry.

It is difficult to conceive a reason to warrant this demand of the honorable member.

A member on the Ministerial side told the honorable member for North-Hastings yesterday that his

object in making his motion was much less to expel Mr. Riel than to try to embarrass the Government. I suspect that the object of the honorable member for Bagot, in proposing his amendment, is absolutely the same.

There seems to be

AN INTIMATE ALLANCE

between the honorable member for North Hastings and the honorable member for Bagot, (extremes meet:) both are on the war path and both are assailing a common enemy; one directs his attack against the right flank and the other against the left, and both hope that, if the enemy escapes from the blows of the one, he will fall under those of the other and that they will succeed in each planting his flag on the fortress top.

Sir. I have not the honor to know the honorable member for North Hastings, and I would not wish to suspect his motives; I do not.....

Mr Bowell:— Oh! don't hesitate; I have no scruples.

Mr Laurier:— But I have. Once more, I say, I have not the advantage of knowing the honorable member for North Hastings. I do not want to suspect his motives; I would rather believe in their sincerity. But, as for my honorable friend, the member for Bagot, I know him too long and too well to not read his game clearly and I do not hesitate to say that he is far less anxious for the amnestying of Mr Riel than he is for compromising the Administration, if possible.

I think that when the honorable member for Provencher learns what is happening here to-day, he will exclaim:

LORD, SAVE ME FROM MY FRIENDS!

As a matter of fact, could the honorable mem-

ber for Bagot seriously hope that the House would adopt his amendment? Why then did he propose it?

It was only last week that the House unanimously named a committee to enquire into the whole question of the amnesty, and, at this very hour, this committee is sitting and Mgr Taché is giving his evidence before it.

Now, Sir, this committee is useful or it is not.

If it has no utility whatever, why did not the honorable member oppose it when it was asked for? Why did he not propose a sub-amendment, recommending the immediate granting of the amnesty? Why did he not save to the country the enormous expense that the enquiry will entail?

If, on the other hand, the enquiry made by the committee may be useful for the amnesty,

WHY NOT WAIT

until Mgr Taché and Father Ritchot have given their evidence? Does the honorable menber for Bagot imagine that he is doing a service to Mr Riel in striving to deprive him of the benefit of the evidence of Mgr Taché and Father Ritchot? Does the member for Bagot think that the evidence of Mgr Taché and Father Ritchot will have less effect towards obtaining the amnesty than his sub-amendment?

Well, if all that has been said about the promises made by the ex-Government to Mr Riel be true, I am in favor of the amnesty, and for this reason I shall not hesitate for an instant about voting against this sub-amendment.

And, if my honorable friend will permit me, I will tell him that his sub-amendment will not have in the province of Quebec the effect he anticipates from it. Because, Sir, I tell the honorable member that from this day forward the province of Quebec will know who are the pretended friends of Mr Riel and what they are aiming at in shouting so loudly in his

behalf. I also trust that Mr Riel will understand that he has been made the tool of a few intriguers, who, in the name of friends, have endeavoured to make him the instrument of their machinations; in fine, I trust that he will understand that his best friends are not those who most pretend to be such.

Yes, I am

IN FAVOR OF THE AMNESTY,

and when the time comes, that is to say, when the committee has made its report, when the proof which has been begun has been closed, I will not be the last to demand it.

I am in favor of the amnesty for two reasons: the first is that given, last night, by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Cameron), that the Canadian Government received the delegates of Mr Riel's government and treated with him as one power treats with another power

If this reason exists in fact, the conclusion is inevitable: the amnesty must be granted. Yesterday, the hon. member for South Bruce, (Mr. Blake), replying to the member for South Ontario, seems to have admitted the legality of the proposition emitted by the latter, because he gave for sole answer that the proposition did not exist as a question of fact, that Mr Riel's delegates had ever been received by the Canadian Government as delegates of Mr. Riel, but as delegates of the people of Red River.

Certainly, I would think it an honor under almost all circumstances to adopt the hon. member for South Bruce's way of thinking, but I cannot do so in this instance—the proof he offered us in support of his opinion being any thing but conclusive to my mind.

In fact, what proof did he give us? Only an extract from a speech delivered in some part of Ontario by the honorable member for Kingston, in which the latter appears to have stated what I have just repeated, namely: that the delegates sent by Mr.

Riel had not been received as the delegates of Mr. Riel, but as the delegates of the people of Red River.

Once more, I say, this proof cannot convince me. For I have yet to learn that the delegates were informed of this distinction at the time of their reception; if such a distinction was made, it must have consisted of a mental restriction by which the honorable member for Kingston said to himself, while ostensibly receiving the delegates of Mr. Riel, that, in reality, he only wished to deal with the delegates of the Red River people.

Whatever may be the case, if the honorable member for Kingston received the delegates of the people of Red River, his colleague, Sir George Cartier, received the delegates of Mr. Riel and they presented to him, as the representative of the Canadian Government, their letters of credit signed with Mr. Riel's own hand.

If this be the case, and it will probably be established by the evidence before the committee, then the logical consequence of this act must follow and the amnesty be granted.

I am in favor of the amnesty for still another reason—because all the acts with which Mr. Riel is charged are

PURELY POLITICAL ACTS.

It was said here yesterday that the execution of Scott was a crime; granted, but it was a political act. The reason of this seems evident; Mr. Riel, in signing the warrant for Scott's execution, did nothing but give effect to the sentence of a court.

However illegal may have been that court, however iniquitous may have been the sentence rendered by that court, the fact alone that it was rendered by a court and that that court existed *de facto* was sufficient to impart an exclusively political character to the execution.

It has also been said that Mr. Riel was only a

rebel. How was it possible to use such language? What act of rebellion did he commit? Did he ever raise any other standard than the national flag? Did he ever proclaim any other authority than the sovereign authority of the Queen? No, never. His whole crime and the crime of his friends was that they wanted to be treated like British subjects and not to be bartered away like common cattle? If that be an act of rebellion, where is the one amongst us, who, if he had happened to have been with them, would not have been rebels as they were? Taken all in all, I would regard the events at Red River in 1869-70 as constituting a glorious page in our history, if unfortunately they had not been stained with the blood of Thomas Scott. But such is the state of human nature and of all that is human:

GOOD AND EVIL

are constantly intermingled; the most glorious cause is not free from impurity and the vilest may have its noble side.

Yes, once more, I say that to ask for the amnesty now will simply render it more difficult to obtain it eventually.

Before sitting down, I may be allowed to sum up in a single word: we have no proof of the facts on which the motion of expulsion rests and to adopt that motion would be not only to commit an arbitrary act, but to establish a precedent which will be a perpetual danger to our free institutions.

THE TARIFF QUESTION IN 1877

PROTECTION *vs* A REVENUE TARIFF

(*HOUSE OF COMMONS*)

SITTING OF THE 22ND MARCH, 1877.

It was during the session of 1877 that Sir John A. Macdonald, for the first time, raised the famous cry of "a National Policy." Mr Laurier took part in the debate after the late Mr Mousseau. Unfortunately there exists only a very incomplete and poor version of his speech in the Official *Hansard*.

Mr. Laurier said he would not attempt to follow the honorable gentleman through the whole range of his argument. Were it necessary, he could cap the quotations cited by superior and counter quotations. Every one must admit that the policy of the Administration was at once comprehensive, definite and clearly mapped out. The First Minister had declared over and over again that, though he was in principle a free-trader, the theory of free-trade could not be adopted in this country in its entirety; and that we could not collect a revenue except by means of Customs duties. The exigencies of the tariff had already increased duties to 17½ per cent., and this was as much protection as was necessary for the manufacturer, and as much as the country could bear. What was the policy of the Opposition as revealed in the motions of the honorable members for Centre Wel-

lington and Kingston? The least that could be said in this relation was that it was loose, vague and very faintly delineated. The right honorable member for Kingston said that the tariff should be remodelled so as to foster the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of the country. No one would say that these words did not sound well. But the country required something more. It required to know whether the means whereby this great result would be achieved were natural or magical. The right honorable member cannot expected any of his colleagues to pledge himself against the policy of the Government unless it was known

WHAT THE POLICY TO REPLACE IT WAS TO BE.

Of course, the result of the resolutions was a foregone conclusion—they would be rejected by a large majority. But, if the result was at all doubtful, or the balance of parties was not as it was, there would only be a more forcible reason that the country should know at once the extent to which the Opposition committed themselves. But the resolution and the arguments of honorable gentlemen opposite had no principle. The resolution of the right honorable member for Kingston contained only one assertion, viz: "That the financial policy submitted by the Government increases the burthen of taxation on the people, without any compensating advantage to Canadian industries." He (Mr. Laurier) took that assertion to be a fallacy and an error. There was no increase of taxation. The tariff was adjusted, but the taxation was not increased. There was an increase in some respects, but a decrease in other respects, and the tariff was not onerous upon the people. Honorable gentleman opposite should not forget that some of the changes arose out of their own action. They should not forget that last year one of their own members showed there was a grievance as to the existing tariff on petroleum, that that interest was over-protected. It was in consequence of the representations

of the honorable member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) that the Government removed the duty on petroleum.

Some hon. members.—Hear! hear!

Mr Laurier said hon. members might say "hear, hear," but the fact was to the credit of the Government, for it showed that they were ready to remedy a wrong whenever it was pointed out to them. But he was not at all surprised that hon. gentlemen regretted that justice had been done in the matter; gentlemen opposite always regretted something, no matter what was done or what was not done. Three years ago they regretted that the tariff was increased from 15 per cent. to 17½ per cent., although this gave some protection to our industries. Last year, every one expected that the tariff would be increased; but it was not, and the Opposition were loud in their regrets. He believed that, if the tariff had been increased, as was anticipated, the Opposition would have been equally loud in their regrets. And now, when the tariff was partly increased and partly decreased, the Opposition were, as ever, loud in their expressions of regret.

THE CHIEF CAUSE OF THEIR GRIEF

was the fact that they had to remain on the Opposition seats. He was quite sure that, if they were on the other side of the House, everything, even though the same as now, would be the best in the world. The resolution of the right hon. member for Kingston in toto was loose and vague, and was prepared with a view to possibilities of future contingencies—that was his candid belief. A policy of protection had never occurred to the right hon. gentleman during his long tenure of office. The present Government would not last forever. Like everything human, it would become a thing of the past; and, therefore, the right hon. member had so framed his resolutions that his party would not be embarrassed when it came into power. The resolution would catch the wind, no matter from

which point of the compass it came. It would not be difficult for the right hon. gentleman and his party to drive a coach and six through their resolution, and let the country have, on its basis, either free trade, protection, incidental protection or a revenue policy. The country had a right to demand more than this. It had a right to demand that the gentlemen opposite should state something definite as to the policy they would adopt when they came into office. He was justified in saying so, not merely on his own opinion, but on the opinion of a gentleman who was connected with the party of the honorable gentlemen opposite, a gentleman whom they always justly held in high estimation. He referred to Mr White, of the Montreal *Gazette*. At the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, which took place in 1874, a resolution was moved by Mr Jas. McPherson(St John's,Q.)as follows:

That a duty of 15 per cent. is fair and reasonable, and no disturbance of the tariff is at present desirable: but,should a revision of the present tariff take place, it is resolved that the interests of our farmers be thoroughly looked after.

Mr White then said:—

I rise to a point of order: Motions should be definite in their character. I submit this one is very indefinite. No one will deny that the interests of the farmer should be looked after. But the motion should be made in such a way that we would understand what the mover meant by looking after.

The President of the Board of Trade, who was a protectionist, said:—

I must say I am pleased that Mr White has raised the question of order, because the motion is too indefinite. It is necessary that, in passing resolutions, we should know what is meant by them.

He would not go the length of saying that the ruling of the President of the Board of Trade ought

to be the ruling of Mr Speaker in the present matter; but he would say that the Opposition ought to give

A MORE EXACT DEFINITION

of their policy. Perhaps the resolution was so worded to produce the result referred to by Talleyrand when he said to his pupils: "Young men, remember that language has been given to men to conceal their thoughts." The Opposition said they were not going to announce their policy; that they could constitutionally refuse to do so. But this was not the language which the great Liberal-Conservative party should use. The Liberal party never shrank from declaring its policy, denouncing abuses and suggesting remedies; and it not only suggested but forced remedies down the throat of the Government which then existed. But, perhaps, it was not fair to expect gentlemen opposite to give the House their policy. He thought they had a very great reason why they should not. And that reason was that they had nothing definite; they had no policy. They had a high-sounding name, which they called the "National Policy." If the motion were to carry, and the Government were defeated, and the Opposition formed a new Administration, the very moment they attempted to carry out their National Policy, there would be a confusion worse than that at the Tower of Babel. Each interest would speak a different language, which would not be understood by the other. Even now they did not agree. They had the name of a National Policy, but not the substance. The resolution of the right honorable member for Kingston proposed protection for three interests—the manufacturing, agricultural and mining. The resolution of the honorable member for Hamilton (Mr Wood) threw overboard the agricultural and mining interests, and only advocated protection to manufactures. But, the moment the amendment to his own motion was made, the right honorable member for Kingston accepted the modification

of his policy. The honorable member for Centre Wellington (Mr Orton) then threw overboard the manufacturing and mining interests, and moved in favor of agriculture alone, and this was at once accepted by the Opposition. He believed that, were a resolution presented in favour of mining alone, it would be supported by the gentlemen opposite. The National Policy had not yet been hatched, and, if it had any basis at all, it was that

THE BREAD OF THE PEOPLE SHOULD BE TAXED,

and this was the remedy proposed for the evils of the present Government by the great Conservative party, which professed to be the friend of the people. He could not speak for any province but his own, but in Quebec the National Policy was held to be a mockery and a farce; it was an inhuman policy, in that it would make fuel and food dearer. As to the charge of inconsistency against the Liberal party of Quebec in this matter, Mr. Papineau was a protectionist not so much from reasons of political economy as political reasons. Our country was then struggling to obtain political liberty and responsible government, and the French Liberal party proposed that we should close ourselves within our own limits and buy nothing from England. But now we were given most ample justice and the most complete liberty, and the result was that, in all this vast empire over which the sun never sets, there were no people more attached to British institutions than French Canadians. He held, however, that there were some industries which could not be established without the aid of legislative action. He said this openly and in the face of his own political friends. Then it might be asked why he favored the policy of the present Government? His answer was that it was because there was

NO NECESSITY FOR MORE PROTECTION

than we had ; the party opposite did not so much want increased protection as to arouse the prejudices of the masses against the Government. It must not be forgotten that the tariff was adequate. We had a temporary deficit, it was true, but that would be met by increased economy. If the gentlemen opposite were in earnest they would point out the industries which wanted protection, but instead of that they did nothing but generalize. When they spoke of protection they said nothing unless they said everything absolutely definite. Free-trade was a principle, but protection was not a principle. When they asserted the doctrine of free-trade they were at once understood. They laid down the principle that all the relations of trade must be regulated by the same conditions. But protection could not be treated as a principle, as it did not carry with it any definite idea. It simply affirmed that certain branches of industry ought to be put beyond the ordinary rules of trade, and that the enhanced price of the article would be more than compensated by the addition to the labour of the country. He called upon the gentlemen opposite to show that 17½ per cent. was not sufficient protection. The country was somewhat prosperous under the regime of the gentlemen opposite, but this fact was against the argument they now used, for the tariff then was lower than at present. But that was not all. His honorable friends from Terrebonne and Bagot, in fact, all who had addressed the House on the Opposition side, had insisted upon

A RETALIATORY POLICY,

they declared they wanted reciprocal trade with the United-States, but, if they could not obtain it, they wanted reciprocity of tariffs, whereby the duties imposed on American goods would be as high as those levied on Canadian goods entering the United States.

If any measure could be calculated to do injury to this country that would be the very measure. Excess in any thing was a bad thing, and protection was not an exception to the rule. Excessive protection to an industry would prove the ruin of that industry. He would quote the words of the honorable member for Stanstead, a protectionist, who, in referring to the petroleum trade, showed the result of excessive protection. They had it from honorable gentlemen opposite that undue protection would destroy the petroleum trade, and, further, that a duty, which was estimated by the honorable member for Stanstead at 25 per cent, had completely destroyed the trade, which had been controlled by an organized "Ring." What was the remedy proposed by honorable gentlemen opposite? The Americans had to pay a duty on our refined petroleum of 40 c. per gallon; the Canadian duty was 15c.; did honorable members opposite propose to retaliate? Did they propose that the Canadian duty should be increased from 15c. to 40c.? Instead of that, they proposed that the 15c. duty should be reduced by one half. That was how honorable gentlemen opposite practised retaliation, while they declared that the Government should adopt a retaliatory policy, yet in practice, instead of asking that the tariff on petroleum should be increased to that of the United States, they asked that it should be decreased. If the protection duty of 25 per cent. on petroleum has destroyed that industry, what would be the effect of imposing a tariff on trade of 40, 50 or 100 per cent.? The effect would be that our industries would be completely annihilated. He could not understand the conduct of honorable gentlemen opposite when they believed the country would not see through such pleas. He supposed these honorable gentlemen would some day return to power, and how would they affirm the policy of retaliation? He asked them to point out how they would retaliate, would they retaliate on everything, petroleum included; would they exclude that article? It was quited evident that the retaliatory policy was

SIMPLY A CRY,

something to suit their purpose for the time, but when they come back to power it would never be heard of again. That retaliatory policy reminded him of the old temple of Janus, the doors of which were open during war but closed as soon as war was over. If hon. gentlemen opposite came back to office, the doors of the retaliatory policy would be closed, never to open more. The theory of retaliation, called a political policy, was a theory of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), as he gave it the other day in his speech.

Mr. Masson said it was not his policy, he gave it as the policy of Sir Alexander Galt.

Mr. Laurier said the hon. member had, perhaps, quoted it as the policy of Sir Alexander Galt. When a man threw himself into the absurd there was no limit for it; because, at the same time, his hon. friend advocated that the Government of the day should not only protect the labour of the country, but should also give labour to the labouring class. The hon. member for Terrebonne,(Mr. Masson), had enunciated what was characterized afterwards by the hon. the Minister of the Interior as communism, a doctrine, which was found in the works of Louis Blanc.Such was contained in his work, published in 1848, called "The Rights of Labour." Napoleon used to say that if they scratched a Russian they were sure to find a Tartar, and if they scratched a Quebec Conservative they would find a Radical of the French school. Extremes always met. The hon. member for Bagot had used language which, for subversive doctrine, was quite equal to that used by the hon. member for Terrebonne. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had attacked the Bench of his country and had spoken of it in derisive and calumnious terms and applied to the Bench a term not found in the French language but by the French press of Lower Canada and applied to the judges.Any man who did not respect the Bench of

his country, and who attacked it in such language, could not be proud of such institutions and would never deserve the name of patriot.

The hon. member for Bagot had gone still farther and in tones of virtuous indignation had even accused the Government and its friends with fattening on the sweat of the people. Fattening on the sweat of the people is a very big word in the mouth of the member for Bagot! The expression is not a new one, but it is something unexpected from the lips of the hon. member. During the French Revolution in the days of Vendemiaire, General Buonaparte had been charged by the Directory with the duty of maintaining order in Paris. He was traversing the theatre of the recent insurrection, when, from a threatening group, an enormously stout fishwoman stepped out, and, with raised arm, shouted: "There is one of those who are fattening on the sweat of the people!" The general, who, at that time was extremely thin, answered her: "But, my good woman, if any one here is fattening on the sweat of the people, which is it—you or I?" The contrast was so striking that the crowd, although a hostile one, burst out into prolonged laughter. I see no other answer to give to the hon. member, whose amplitude and language have served to recall this incident to my mind. I am one of the friends of the Government; I am therefore one of those assailed by his virtuous indignation, but I take the whole world to witness, if any one here is fattening on the sweat of the people, which is it—he or I?

He would not do the same injustice to the Conservatives as they, the Liberals, had to suffer every day. He would not say they were Communists but Conservatives of Quebec would stop short of nothing to obtain position. They would tax the people's bread, they would attack the Bench, and, as was said one day by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Rymal), the ferocity of a she-bear deprived of her cubs was nothing compared with that of the Tory party when deprived of the spoils of office.

POLITICAL LIBERALISM

DEFINITION OF THE LIBERAL IDEA

MR. LAURIER AN ADMIRER AND DISCIPLE OF THE ENGLISH LIBERAL SCHOOL

Lecture delivered at the Academy of Music, Quebec, on the invitation of the Club Canadien, on the 26th June, 1877.

[Translation.]

Mr President,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I cannot conceal the fact that it was with a certain feeling of pleasure that I accepted the invitation to come before you to explain what are the doctrines of the Liberal party and what the word "Liberalism" means as regards the Liberals of the province of Quebec.

I say that it was not without a certain feeling of pleasure that I accepted; but I would certainly have refused if I had looked only to the difficulties of the task. However, if the difficulties of that task are numerous and delicate, on the other hand I am so imbued with the importance for the Liberal party of clearly defining its position, before the public opinion of the province, that this consideration was to my mind far above all the others.

In fact, I do not deceive myself with regard to the

position of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec and I have no hesitation in immediately saying that it occupies a false position fron the standpoint of public opinion. I know that, in the eyes of a large number of my fellow countrymen, the Liberal party is a party composed of men of perverse doctrines and dangerous tendencies, pressing knowingly and deliberately towards revolution. I know that, in the eyes of a portion of my fellow countrymen, the Liberal party is a party of men with upright intentions, perhaps, but victims and dupes of principles which are leading them unconsciously, but fatally, towards revolution. In fine, I know that, in the eyes of another, and not the least considerable portion, perhaps, of our people, Liberalism is a new form of evil, a heresy carrying with it its own condemnation.

I know all this and it is because I know it, that I have accepted the invitation to come here. I have not the presumption to believe that anything I might say here to-night will have the effect of dissipating any of the prejudices existing at present against us; my only ambition is to lead the way in the hope that it will be followed by others and that the work thus begun will be fully carried out; my pretensions go no farther than this.

And let no one say that this manifestation is useless or untimely.

It is neither useless nor untimely to combat the prejudices which have been by raised like a barrier everywhere between us and public opinion; it is neither useless nor untimely to clearly define our position as it really is.

It is quite true that we have been already long enough before public opinion to give it full opportunity to know and appreciate us. But it is equally true that, if we have had our enemies like every other political party, we have been more assailed than any other political party. Of our enemies, the one have systematically slandered us; the others have in good faith calumniated us. Both have represented us as

professing doctrines, the effect of which, foreseen and calculated by some of us, not foreseen by, but fatal for the others, would be the overthrow of our society, the revolution with all its horrors. To reply to these charges and to defend our position is the object of the demonstration of this evening organized by the *Club Canadien*.

To my mind, the most efficacious, the only way, in fact, to defeat these charges, to defend our ideas and principles, is to make them known. Yes, I am convinced that the exposure alone of our principles will be their best and most eloquent apology.

And when we shall have made ourselves known as we are, when we shall have made known our principles as they are, we shall have gained, I believe, a double point. The first will be to rally to our side all the friends of liberty, all those, who, before 1837 or after it, labored to secure for us responsible government, government of the people by the people, and who, on the establishment of that form of government, separated from us through fear that we were in reality what we were represented to be, and that the realization of the ideas ascribed to us would lead to the destruction of the government which they had had so much trouble in establishing. The second point will be to force our real enemies, all who at bottom are enemies more or less disguised of liberty, to no longer appeal against us to prejudices and fear, but to come forward frankly as we do before the people with their ideas and their acts.

And when the fight takes place on the ground of pure questions of principle, when acts are judged according to the thoughts by which they are inspired, when people will be no longer afraid to accept the good and reject the bad under the impression that, in accepting the one and rejecting the other, strength will be only given to a party of perverse doctrines and dangerous tendencies, it matters little to me on which side victory will then perch. When I state that it matters little to me on which side victory will perch,

I do not mean to say that I am indifferent to the result of the struggle. I mean this: if the struggle turns against us, the opinion expressed will be the free expression of the people; but I am convinced that a day will come when our ideas, planted in the soil, will germinate and bear fruit, if the seed is sound and just.

Yes, I am confident, I am certain that if our ideas are just, as I believe they are, if they are an emanation of the eternal and immutable truth, as I believe they are, they will not perish; they may be rejected, reviled, persecuted, but a day will come when they will germinate, spring up and grow, as soon as the sun shall have done its work and prepared the ground.

I have already noted some of the charges made against us; I shall return to the subject, as it is the most important point. All the charges made against, us all the objections to our doctrines, may be crystallized into the following propositions: 1° Liberalism is a new form of error, a heresy already virtually condemned by the head of the Church: 2° A Catholic cannot be a Liberal.

This is what our adversaries proclaim.

Mr. President, all who honor me with their attention at this moment will do me the justice of recognizing that I put the question as it is and that I exaggerate nothing. All will do me the justice of admitting that I reproduce faithfully the reproaches which are day after day cast up to us. All will acknowledge that it is well and truly the language of the Conservative press.

I know that Catholic Liberalism has been condemned by the head of the Church. But I will be asked; what is Catholic Liberalism? On the threshold of this question I stop. This question does not come within the purview of my subject: moreover, it is not of my competence. But I know and I say that Catholic Liberalism is not political Liberalism. If it were true that the ecclesiastical censures hurled against Catholic Liberalism should also apply to political

Liberalism this fact would constitute for us, French by origin and Catholics by religion a state of things, the consequences of which would be as strange as they would be painful.

In fact, we, French Canadians, are a conquered race. This is a melancholy truth to utter, but it is the truth. But, if we are a conquered race, we have also made a conquest: the conquest of liberty. We are a free people; we are a minority, but we have retained all our rights and all our privileges. Now, what is the cause to which we owe this liberty? It is the constitution which was conquered by our forefathers and which we enjoy to day. We have a constitution which bases the government on the suffrage of the citizens and which was granted to us for our own protection. We have not more rights or more privileges, but we have as many rights and as many privileges as the other elements, which go to make up the Canadian family. But it must not be forgotten that the other members of the Canadian family are divided into two parties, the Liberal party and the Conservative party.

Now, if we, who are Catholics, are not to have the right to have our preferences, if we are not to have the right to belong to the Liberal party, one of two things must happen, either we would be obliged to abstain completely from taking any share in the management of the affairs of the State and then, the constitution—that constitution which was granted to us for our own protection—would be no longer in our hands only a dead letter; or we would be obliged to take a part in the management of the affairs of the State under the direction and to the profit of the Conservative party and then, our action being no longer free, the constitution would again be in our hands a dead letter and we would in addition have the ignominy of being regarded by the other members of the Canadian family composing the Conservative party as tools and slaves.

Do not these absurd consequences, the strict accu-

racy of which nobody can question, conclusively show how false is the assertion that a Catholic cannot belong to the Liberal party ?

Since Providence has united together on this corner of earth populations of different origins and creeds, is it not manifest that these populations must have together common and identical interests and that, in all that affects these interests, each one is free to follow either the Liberal party or the Conservative party, according to the dictates of his conscience ?

For my part, I belong to the Liberal party. If it be wrong to be a Liberal, I accept the reproach ; if it be a crime to be Liberal, then I am guilty of it. For my part, I only ask one thing—that we be judged according to our principles. I would be ashamed of our principles, if we were afraid to give expression to them and our cause would not be worth the efforts for its triumph, if the best way to secure that triumph was to conceal its nature. The Liberal party has been for twenty-five years in Opposition and let it remain there for twenty-five years more, if the people has not yet been educated up to accepting its ideas, but let it march proudly with its banners displayed, in the full face of the country !

Before all, however, it is important to come to an understanding upon the meaning, value and bearing of the word " Liberal " and that other word " Conservative. "

I maintain that there is not one thing less understood in this country by its assailants than Liberalism and there are several reasons for this.

It is only yesterday that we were initiated into representative institutions. The English element understand the working of these institution in some way by instinct, as well as by long experience. On the other hand, our people hardly understand them yet. Education is only beginning to spread among-st us and, in the case of the educated, our French education leads us naturally to study the history of modern

liberty, not in the classic land of liberty, not in the history of old England; but among the peoples of the continent of Europe, of the same origin and faith as ourselves. And there, unfortunately, the history of liberty has been written in letters of blood on the most harrowing pages which the annals of the human race, perhaps, contain. In all classes of educated society may be seen loyal souls, who, frightened by these mournful pages, regard with terror the spirit of liberty, imagining that it must produce here the same disasters and the same crimes as in the countries I have just referred to. In the eyes of such well meaning people, the very word "Liberalism" is fraught with national calamity.

Without blaming altogether these fears, but without allowing ourselves to be frightened by them, let us go back to the fountain head itself and calmly examine what is at the bottom of those two words: *Liberal, Conservative!* What idea is hidden under this word *Liberal* that it should have called down upon us so many anathemas! What idea is hidden under the word *Conservative* that it should be modestly applied to everything that is good? Is the one, as is pretended and, in fact, asserted every day, the expression of a new form of error? Is the other, as it seems to be constantly insinuated, the definition of good under all its aspects? Does the one mean revolt, anarchy, disorder, and is the other the only stable principle of society? These are questions which people are putting to themselves daily in our country. These subtle distinctions, which are constantly appearing in our press, are nevertheless not new. They are only the repetition of the fancies of certain French writers, whose horizon is bounded by the narrow limits of their sanctums and who, only looking to the past, bitterly criticize everything existing in the present for the simple reason that nothing now existing resembles anything that existed formerly.

These writers proclaim that the Liberal idea is a new idea, but they are mistaken. The Liberal idea

is no more a new idea than is the contrary idea. It is as old as the world and is found written on every page of the world s history, but it is only in our days that we have come to know its force and its law and to understand how to utilize it. Steam existed before Fulton, but it has only been since Fulton that we have learned all the extent of its power and how to make it produce its marvellous effects. The combination of the tube and piston is the instrument by which we utilize steam and the system of representative governments is the instrument which has revealed to the world the two principles, Liberal and Conservative, and by which we get from that form of government all its effects.

Upon any subject whatever, within the range of human things, the truth does not manifest itself equally to all intellects. There are some whose gaze pierces further into the unknown, but takes in less at a time; there are others whose gaze, even if it be less penetrating, perceives more clearly within the sphere which it embraces. This primordial distinction at once explains to a certain extent the Liberal idea and the Conservative idea. For this sole reason, the same object will not be seen under the same aspect by different eyes; for this sole reason, the one will take a route which the others will avoid, although both propose to arrive at the same end. But there is a conclusive reason which clearly explains the nature and the why and the wherefore of the two different ideas. Macaulay, in his history of England, sets forth this reason with admirable clearness. Speaking of the meeting of the Houses for the second session of the Long Parliament (1), the great historian says:

> From that day dates the corporate existence of the two great parties which have ever since alternately governed the country. In one sense, indeed, the distinction which then became obvious had always existed and always must exist; for it has its origin in diversities of temper, of understanding,

(1) *History of England*, Macaulay, vol. I.

and of interest, which are found in all socie ies and which will be found until the human mind ceases to be drawn in opposite directions by the charm of habit and by the charm of novelty. Not only in politics, but in literature, in art, in science, in surgery and mechanics, in navigation and agriculture, nay, even in mathematics, we find this distinction. Everywhere there is a class of men who cling with fondness to whatever is ancient and who, even when convinced by overpowering reasons that innovation would be beneficial, consent to it with many misgivings and forebodings. We find also everywhere another class of men sanguine in hope, bold in speculation, always pressing forward, quick to discern the imperfection of whatever exists, disposed to think lightly of the risks and inconveniences which attend improvements and disposed to give every change credit for being an improvement.

The former are the Conservatives; the latter are the Liberals. Here you have the real meaning, the true explanation, of the Liberal principle. They are two attributes of our nature. As Macaulay admirably expresses it, they are to be found everywhere: in the arts, in the sciences and in all the branches open to human speculation: but it is in politics that thay are most apparent.

Consequently, those who condemn Liberalism as a new idea have not reflected upon what is transpiring every day under their eyes. Those who condemn Liberalism as an error have not reflected that, in so doing, they condemn an attribute of human nature.

Now, it should not be overlooked that our form of government is a representative monarchy. This is the instrument which throws into relief and brings into action the two principles, Liberal and Conservative. We, Liberals, are often accused of being Republicans. I do not note this reproach for the purpose of taking it up, for it is not worth taking up. I merely state that the form matters little; whether it be monarchical or republican, the moment the people exercise the right to vot·, the moment they have a responsible government, they have the full measure of liberty. Still, liberty would soon be no more than an empty

name, if it left without control those who have the direction of power. A man, whose astonishing sagacity has formulated the axioms of governmental science with undeviating accuracy, Junius, has said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Yes, if a people want to remain free, they must like Argus have a hundred eyes and be always on the alert. If they slumber, or relax, each moment of indolence loses them a particle of their rights. Eternal vigilance is the price which they have to pay for the priceless boon of liberty. Now, the form of a representative monarchy lends itself marvellously—much more, perhaps than the republican form—to the exercise of this necessary vigilance. On the one hand, you have those who govern and, on the other, those who watch. On the one hand, you have those who are in power and have an interest in remaining there, and, on the other, those who have an interest in getting there. What is the bond of cohesion to unite each individual of the different groups? What is the principle, the sentiment, to range these diverse elements of the population either among those who govern or those who watch? It is the Liberal principle or the Conservative principle. You will see together those who are attracted by the charm of novelty and you will see together those who are attracted by the charm of habit. You will see together those who are attached to all that is ancient and you will see together those who are always disposed to reform.

Now, I ask: between these two ideas which constitute the basis of parties, can there be a moral difference? Is the one radically good and the other radically bad? Is it not evident that both are what are termed in moral philosophy *indifferents*, that is to say, that both are susceptible of being appreciated, pondered and chosen? Would it not it be as unfair as it would be absurd to condemn or to approve either the one or the other as absolutely bad or good?

Both are susceptible of much good, as they are also of much evil. The Conservative, who defends his

country's old institutions may do much good, as he also may do much evil, if he be obstinate in maintaining abuses, which have become intolerable. The Liberal, who contends against these abuses and who, after long efforts, succeeds in extirpating them, may be a public benefactor, just as the Liberal who lays a rash hand on hallowed institutions may be a scourge not only for his own country, but for humanity at large.

Certainly, I am far from blaming my adversaries for their convictions, but for my part, as I have already said, I am a Liberal. I am one of those who think that everywhere, in human things, there are abuses to be reformed, new horizons to be opened up, and new forces to be developed.

Morever, Liberalism seems to me in all respects superior to the other principle. The principle of Liberalism is inherent to the very essence of our nature, to that desire of happiness with which we are all born into the world, which pursues us throughout life and which is never completely gratified on this side of the grave. Our souls are immortal, but our means are limited. We constantly gravitate towards an ideal which we never attain. We dream of good, but we never realize the best. We only reach the goal we have proposed to ourselves, to discover new horizons opening up, which we had not before even suspected. We rush on towards them and those horizons, explored in their turn, reveal to us others which lead us on ever further and further.

And thus it will be as long as man is what he is, as long as the immortal soul inhabits a mortal body; his desires will be always vaster than his means and his actions will never rise to the height of his conceptions. He is the real Sysiphus of the fable: his work always finished has always to be begun over again.

This condition of our nature is precisely what makes the greatness of man, for it condemns him irrevocably to movement, to progress: our means are limited, but our nature is perfectible and we have the

infinite for our arena. Thus, there is always room for improvement of our condition, for the perfecting of our nature, and for the attainment by a larger number of an easier life. Here again is what, in my eyes, constitutes the superiority of Liberalism.

In addition, experience has established that insensibly, imperceptibly, abuses will creep into the body social and end by seriously obstructing its upward march, if not endangering its existence.

Experience has further established that institutions which, at the outset, were useful because they were adapted to the state of society at the time of their introduction, often end by becoming intolerable abuses owing to the simple fact that everything around them has changed. Such was the case in our own midst with the seigniorial tenure. It is unquestionable that, in the infancy of the colony, that system greatly facilitated the settlement of the soil. But, in 1850, everything had changed so much amongst us that the system would have eventuated in deplorable complications, if our Legislature, upon the initiative of the Liberals, had not had the wisdom to abolish it.

As a consequence of the law which I have indicated as the determining cause of the Liberal and Conservative ideas, there will be always men found, who will attach themselves with love to these abuses, defend them to the bitter end, and view with dismay any attempt to suppress them. Woe to such men, if they do not know how to yield and adopt proposed reforms! They will draw down upon their country disturbances all the more terrible that justice shall have been long refused. History, alas! superabundantly shows that very few of those who govern have been able to understand these aspirations of humanity and satisfy them. Indeed, more revolutions have been caused by Conservative obstinacy than by Liberal exaggeration.

The supreme art of government consists in guiding, directing and controlling these aspirations of human nature. The English are, in a high degree,

masters of this art. Look at the work of the great Liberal party of England! How many reforms has it not brought about, how many abuses corrected, without shock, disturbance and violence! Understanding the aspirations of the oppressed and the new wants created by new situations, it has carried out, under the sanction of the law and without other aid than the law, a series of reforms which has made the English people the freest people and the most prosperous and happy of Europe.

On the other hand, look at the continental governments! The most of them have never been able to grasp these aspirations of their peoples. No sooner do the sufferers raise their heads to catch a few breaths of air and of freedom, than they are brutally crushed back again into a circle which is ever growing more and more hermetically restricted.

But the day comes when the obstacles are shivered to pieces, when these peoples break forth from there paralyzing restraints, and, then, in the holy name of liberty, the most frightful crimes are committed. Is there reason to be surprised at this?

Are we astonished when the storm clouds, rolling over our heads, burst forth in hail and lightning? Are we surprised at the explosion of the steam-boiler, when the engineer neglects to open the safety valve and relieve it of its superabundant pressure? No, because we see in these events the working of an inevitable law which is always attended with the same effects, as well in the moral as in the physical system. Wherever there is compression, there will be explosion, violence and ruin. I do not say this to excuse revolutions, as I hate revolutions and detest all attempts to win the triumph of opinions by violence. But I am less inclined to cast the responsibility on those who make them than on those who provoke them by their blind obstinacy. I say this to illustrate the superiority of Liberalism, which understands the aspirations of human nature, and, instead of doing violence to them, seeks to direct them.

Can it be believed, for instance, that—if England had persisted in refusing emancipation to the Catholics; if it had persisted in refusing the fullness of their civil and political rights to the Catholics, the Jews and the other Protestant denominations not forming part of the established church; if it had persisted in keeping the suffrage limited to a small number; if it had persisted in refusing free trade in breadstuffs: if it had persisted in refusing the right of suffrage to the working classes—a day would not have come when the people would have risen in arms to do themselves the justice that would have been obstinately denied to them? Do you think that riot would not have raised its hideous head under the windows of Westminister and that the blood of civil war would not have reddened the streets of London, as it has so often reddened the streets of Paris? Human nature is the same all over, and there, as elsewhere, compression would have produced explosion, violence and ruin. These terrible calamities, however, were obviated by the initiative of the Liberals who, understanding the evil, proposed and applied the remedy.

What is grander than the history of the great English Liberal party during the present century? On its threshold, looms up the figure of Fox, the wise, the generous Fox, defending the cause of the oppressed, wherever there were oppressed to be defended. A little later, comes O'Connell, claiming and obtaining for his co-religionists the rights and privileges of English subjects. He is helped in this work by all the Liberals of the three kingdoms, Grey, Brougham, Russell, Jeffrey and a host of others. Then come, one after the other, the abolition of the ruling oligarchy, the repeal of the corn laws, the extension of the suffrage to the working classes, and, lastly, to crown the whole, the disestablishment of the church of England as the State religion in Ireland. And note well: the Liberals, who carried out these successive reforms, were not recruited from the middle classes only, but some of their most eminent leaders

were recruited from the peerage of England. I know of no spectacle that reflects greater honor on humanity than the spectacle of these peers of England, these rich and powerful nobles, stubbornly fighting to eradicate a host of venerable abuses and sacrificing their privileges with calm enthusiasm to make life easier and happier for a larger number of their fellow beings. While on this head, permit me to cite a letter of Macaulay's written to one of his friends on the next day after the vote on the famous Reform bill, which put an end to the system of *rotten-boroughs*[1]. Here it is. I ask pardon for making this quotation, as it is somewhat long :

Such a scene as the division of last Tuesday I never saw, and never expect to see again. If I should live fifty years, the impression of it will be as fresh and sharp in my mind as if it had just taken place. It was like seeing Cæsar stabbed in the Senate-house, or seeing Oliver taking the mace from the table ; a sight to be seen only once, and never to be forgotten. The crowd overflowed the House in every part. When the strangers were cleared out, and the doors locked, we had six hundred and eight members present—more by fifty-five than ever were on a division before. The ayes and noes were like two volleys of cannon from opposite sides of a field of battle. When the Opposition went out into the lobby, an operation which took up twenty minutes or more, we spread ourselves over the benches on both sides of the House ; for there were many of us who had not been able to find a seat during the evening. When the doors were shut we began to speculate on our numbers. Everybody was desponding. " We have lost it. We are only two hundred and eighty at most. I do not think we are two hundred and fifty. They are three hundred. Alderman Thompson has counted them. He says they are two hundred and ninety-nine. " This was the talk on our benches. The House, when only the ayes were in it, looked to me a very fair House—much fuller than it generally is even on debates of considerable interest. I had no hope, however, of three hundred. As the tellers passed along our lowest row on the left-hand side the interest was insupportable—two hundred and ninety-one—two hundred and ninety-two—we were all standing up and stretching forward, telling with the tellers. At three hundred there was a short cry of joy—at

[1] *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, by Trevelyan.

three hundred and two another—suppressed, however, in a moment, for we did not yet know what the hostile force might be. We knew, however, that we could not be severely beaten. The doors were thrown open, and in they came. Each of them, as he entered, brought some different report of their numbers. It must have been impossible, as you may conceive, in the lobby, crowded as they were, to form any exact estimate. First we heard that they were three hundred and three; then that number rose to three hundred and ten; then went down to three hundred and seven. We were all breathless with anxiety, when Charles Wood, who stood near the door, jumped up on a bench and cried out, "They are only three hundred and one." We set up a shout that you might have heard to Charing Cross, waving our hats, stamping against the floor, and clapping our hands. The tellers scarcely got through the crowd; for the House was thronged up to the table, and all the floor was fluctuating with heads like the pit of a theatre. But you might have heard a pin drop as Duncannon read the numbers. Then again the shouts broke out, and many of us shed tears. I could scarcely refrain. And the jaw of Peel fell; and the face of Twiss was as the face of a damned soul; and Herries looked like Judas taking his neck-tie off for the last operation. We shook hands, and clapped each other on the back, and went out laughing, crying, and huzzaing into the lobby. And no sooner were the outer doors opened than another shout answered that within the House. All the passages and the stairs into the waiting-rooms were thronged by people who had waited till four in the morning to know the issue. We passed through a narrow lane between two thick masses of them; and all the way down they were shouting and waving their hats, till we got into the open air. I called a cabriolet, and the first thing the driver asked was, "Is the bill carried?" "Yes, by one." "Thank God for it, sir!" And Macaulay concludes with a sentence strongly indicative of the Liberal: "And so ended a scene which will probably never be equaled till the reformed Parliament wants reforming."

The man, who wrote in these cheery terms, had just come from voting the abolition of the system by virtue of which he held his own seat. Macaulay owed his seat to the generosity of an English peer, Lord Lansdowne, who had him returned for the *rotten borough* of Calne. I know of few pages that do more honor to humanity then this simple letter which

shows us these English natures, calm but steadfast in the fight and only kindling into emotion when the battle has been won, because an act of justice has been accomplished and an abuse uprooted from the soil of old England.

Members of the *Club Canadien*, Liberals of the province of Quebec, there are our models! there are our principles! there is our party!

It is true that there is in Europe, in France, in Italy and in Germany, a class of men, who give themselves the title of Liberals, but who have nothing of the Liberal about them but the name and who are the most dangerous of men. These are not Liberals; they are revolutionaries: in their principles they are so extravagant that they aim at nothing less than the destruction of modern society. With these men, we have nothing in common; but it is the tactic of our adversaries to always assimilate us to them. Such accusations are beneath our notice and the only answer we can with dignity give them is to proclaim our real principles and to so conduct ourselves that our acts will conform with our principles.

Now, at this stage of my discourse, I shall review the history of the Liberal party of this country. I am one of those who do not fear to scrutinize the history of my party. I am one of those who think there is more to be gained by frankly stating the truth than by trying to deceive ourselves and others. Let us have the courage to tell the truth! If our party has committed mistakes, our denials will not change matters; moreover, if our party has committed faults, we shall always find in the other party enough of faults to balance ours, and, even if the other party were immaculate, our principles would not, for that reason, be either better or worse. Let us have the courage to tell the truth and let it prevent us from falling into the same faults in the future!

Down to 1848, all the French Canadians were of but one party, the Liberal party. The Conservative or rather the Tory party, as it was called, only

represented a feeble minority. But, from 1848, date the first traces of the two parties, which have since disputed power. Mr. Lafontaine had accepted the regime established in 1841. When Mr. Papineau returned from exile, he assailed the new order of things with his great eloquence and all his elevation of mind. I shall not here undertake to enter into a criticism of the respective policies of these two great men. Both loved their country ardently, passionately; both had devoted to it their lives; both, in different ways, had no other ambition than to serve it; and both were pure and disinterested. Let us be content with these souvenirs, without seeking which of the two was right and which wrong!

There was at this time a generation of young men of great talent and still greater impetuosity of character. Disappointed at having come on the scene too late to stake their heads during the events of 1837, they threw themselves with blind alacrity into the political movement of the day. They were among the foremost of Mr. Lafontaine's partisans in his glorious struggle against Lord Metcalf. They afterwards abandoned him for the more advanced policy of Mr. Papineau, and, though taking their places among his following, as was natural, they soon went beyond him.

Emboldened by their success and carried away by their enthusiasm, they one day founded *L'Avenir* in which they posed as reformers and regenerators of their country. Not satisfied with attacking the political situation, they boldly attacked the social situation. They issued a programme containing not less than twenty-one articles commencing with the election of justices of the peace and ending with annexation to the United-States, and, taken as a whole, practically amounting to a complete revolution of the province. If, by the wave of some magic wand, the twenty-one articles of this programme had been realized in a single night, the country in the morning would have been no longer recognizable, and the person, who should have

left it the evening before and returned the next day, would not have known where he was.

The only excuse for these Liberals was their youth. The oldest of them was not more than twenty-two years of age.

Gentlemen, I am stating facts. I have no intention of reproaching any one. Talent and sincere convictions are entitled to respect. Moreover, who is the one amongst us, who, if he had been living at that time, could flatter himself that he would have been wiser and that he would not have fallen into the same mistakes ? Everything was favorable to such exaggerations : the situation of our own country and the situation in Europe.

The wounds of the country from the insurrection were not yet healed : we had been granted, it is true, a free constitution, but the new constitution was not being applied in good faith by the Colonial Office. There was at the bottom of every soul a discontented spirit, which was alone kept down by the recollection of the vengeance for which the insurrection had furnished the opportunity. Moreover, from all sides, the effluvia of democracy and revolt came pouring in upon us. Society was already shivering in the first blasts of that great storm, which was to break forth a few years later over the whole civilized world and which for a moment caused society to stagger. The years preceding 1848 are frightful to contemplate. One feels a thrill of honor at the contemplation of the sinister work which was being everywhere done and which at one time drew into revolt upwards of eighty millions of men.

This state of things naturally made a powerful impression on young, ardent and inexperienced imaginations, and, not satisfied with wanting to revolutionize their own country, our young reformers greeted with transports each fresh revolution in Europe.

However, hardly had they taken two steps in life, when they perceived their immense error. In

1852, they brought out another newspaper. They abandoned *L'Avenir* to the demagogues and sought in a new paper, *Le Pays*—without, however, finding it, it is true—the new path which should be followed by the friends of liberty under the new constitution.

One cannot help smiling to-day on reading over again *L'Avenir's* programme; one cannot help smiling at finding, mixed up with so much good sense occasionally, so many absurd or impossible propositions. It would be tiresome to review one by one all the incongruous propositions which *L'Avenir's* programme contained. I shall take one at random: Annual Parliaments. I am satisfied that each of the young Reformers of that day, who is to-day in Parliament, is firmly convinced that an election every five years is quite sufficient. And moreover is it not obvious that annual Parliaments would be a constant obstacle to all serious legislation and a permanent source of agitation?

Still, the harm was done. The clergy, alarmed at these proceedings which reminded them of the revolutionaries of Europe, at once declared merciless war on the new party. The English population, friendly to liberty, but also friendly to the maintenance of order, also ranged themselves against the new party, and during twenty-five years that party has remained in Opposition, although to it belongs the honor of having taken the initiative in all the reforms accomplished during that period. It was in vain that it demanded and obtained the abolition of the seigniorial tenure; it was in vain that it demanded and obtained judicial decentralization, and it was in vain that it was the first to give an impetus to the work of colonization; it was not credited with these wise reforms; it was in vain that those children, now grown into men, disavowed the rashness of their youth; it was in vain that the Conservative party made mistake after mistake: the generation of the Liberals of 1848 had almost entirely disappeared from the political scene ere the dawn of a new day

began to break for the Liberal party. Since that time, the party has received new accessions, calmer and more thoughtful ideas have prevailed in it: and, as for the old programme, nothing whatever remains of its social part, while, of the political part, there only remain the principles of the English Liberal party.

During all this time, what was the other party doing? When the split between Mr. Papineau and Mr. Lafontaine became complete, the fraction of the Liberal party, who followed Mr. Lafontaine, wound up, after some groping, by allying themselves with the Tories of Upper Canada, and then, to the title of Liberal which they could not or dared not yet avow, they added that of Conservative. The new party took the name of Liberal-Conservative. Some years elapsed and fresh modifications ensued. I know no longer by what name we call this party. Those who to-day seem to occupy leading positions in it will call themselves the Ultramontane party, the Catholic party. Its principles, like its name, have been modified. If Mr. Cartier were to come back to the earth to-day, he would not recognize his party. Mr. Cartier was devoted to the principles of the English constitution. Those who to-day take the lead among his old partisans openly reject the principles of the English constitution as a concession to what they term the spirit of evil. They understand neither their country, nor their time. All their ideas are modelled on those of the reactionists of France. They go into ecstacies over Don Carlos or the Comte de Chambord just as the Liberals admired Louis Blanc and Ledru-Rollin. They shout: long live the King! as the Liberals shouted: long live the Republic! In speaking of Don Carlos and the Comte de Chambord, they affect to always say only His Majesty the king Charles VII, His Majesty the king Henry V, just as the Liberals, in speaking of Napoleon III always said only Mr. Louis Buonaparte.

I have too much respect for the opinion of my

adversaries to ever insult them; but I reproach them with understanding neither their time nor their country. I accuse them of judging the political situation of the country, not according to what is happening in it, but according to what is happening in France. I accuse them of wanting to introduce here ideas, which are impossible of application in our state of society. I accuse them of laboriously and, by misfortune, too efficaciously working to degrade religion to the simple proportions of a political party.

In our adversaries' party, it is the habit to accuse us, Liberals, of irreligion. I am not here to parade my religious sentiments, but I declare that I have too much respect for the faith in which I was born to ever use it as the basis of a political organization.

You wish to organize a Catholic party. But have you not considered that, if you have the misfortune to succeed, you will draw down upon your country calamities of which it is impossible to foresee the consequences?

You wish to organize all the Catholics into one party, without other bond, without other basis, than a common religion; but have you not reflected that, by the very fact, you will organize the Protestant population as a single party and that then, instead of the peace and harmony now prevailing between the different elements of the Canadian population, you throw open the door to war, a religious war, the most terrible of all wars?

Once more, Conservatives, I accuse you in the face of Canada of not understanding either your country or your time.

Our adversaries also reproach us with loving liberty and they term the spirit of liberty a dangerous and subversive principle.

Is there any justification for these attacks? None whatever, except that there exists in France a group of Catholics who pursue liberty with their imprecations. Assuredly, it is not the enemies of liberty in France alone who regard it with terror. The

most ardent friends of liberty often contemplate it with the same feeling. Recall Madame Rolland's last words. She had warmly loved liberty, she had ardently prayed for it, and her last word was a sorrowful one: "Oh! Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" How often have the same words been as sincerely uttered by fully as sincere friends of liberty!

I can readily conceive, without, however, sharing them, the feelings of those Frenchmen, who, regarding how much liberty has cost them in tears, blood and ruin, have some times favored for their country a vigorous despotism; I can conceive their anathemas, but that these anathemas should be repeated in our midst is a thing I cannot understand.

What? Is it a conquered race, who should curse liberty? But what would we be without liberty? What would be to-day if our forefathers had cherished the same sentiments as the Conservatives of the present time? Would we be other than a race of pariahs?

I frankly admit that liberty, as it has been generally understood and practised in France, has nothing very attractive about it. The French have had the name of liberty, but they have not yet had liberty itself. One of their poets, Auguste Barbier, has given us a pretty correct idea of the kind of liberty which is some times in vogue in France and which was last seen at work in 1871. He represents it as a woman

A la voix rauque, aux durs appas
Qui, du brun sur la peau, du feu dans les prunelles,
Agile et marchant à grands pas,
Se plait aux cris du peuple, aux sanglantes mêlées,
Aux longs roulements des tambours,
A l'odeur de la poudre, aux lointaines volées
Des cloches et des canons sourds;
Qui ne prend ses amours que dans la populace.
Et ne prête son large flanc
Qu'à des gens forts comme elle, et qui veut qu'on l'embrasse
Avec des bras rouges de sang.

If liberty was well and truly this sinister virago, I could understand the anathemas of our adversaries and I would be the first to join in them. But it is not liberty. An English poet, Tennyson, has sung about liberty, the liberty of his country and of ours. In his poem *In Memoriam*, Tennyson addresses himself to a friend who enquires why he does not seek a milder climate in the South Sea islands and why, notwithstanding his impaired health, he persists in remaining under the foggy skies of England? And the poet replies:

It is the land that freemen till,
That sober-suited Freedom chose,
The land where, girt with friends or foes,
A man may speak the thing he will;

A land of settled government,
A land of just and old renown,
Where Freedom broadens slowly down,
From precedent to precedent;

Where faction seldom gathers head
But by degrees to fulness wrought,
The strength of some diffusive thought
Hath time and space to work and spread.

This is the liberty we enjoy and defend and this is the liberty, which our adversaries, sharing in its benefits, attack, without understanding it. Jean Baptiste Rousseau (1), in one of his odes, speak of barbarous peoples, who, one day in a moment of inconceivable folly, fell to insulting the sun with their cries and imprecations. The poet, in a word, characterizes this stupid piece of impiety:

Le Dieu poursuivant sa carrière,
Versait des torrents de lumière
Sur ses obscurs blasphémateurs.

(1) The orator has confound d J. B. Rousseau with Lefranc de Pompignan; but the two great lyric poets are so often cited together in collections of literature that the lecturer, who was quoting from memory, may easily be pardoned this *qui pro quo*.

In the same way liberty has its assailants among us. Liberty covers them, floods them, protects them and defends them even in their imprecations.

> Le Dieu poursuivant sa carrière
> Versait des torrents de lumière
> Sur ses obscurs blasphémateurs.

But, while reproaching us with being friends of liberty our adversaries further reproach us, with an inconsistency which would be serious, if the charge were well founded, with denying to the Church the freedom to which it is entitled. They reproach us with seeking to silence the administrative body of the Church and to prevent it from teaching the people their duties as citizens and electors. They reproach us with wanting to hinder the clergy from meddling in politics and to relegate them to the sacristy.

In the name of the Liberal party and of Liberal principles, I repel this assertion.

I maintain that there is not one Canadian Liberal who wants to prevent the clergy from taking part in political affairs, if they wish to do so.

In the name of what principle, should the friends of liberty seek to deny to the priest the right to take part in political affairs? In the name of what principle should the friends of liberty seek to deny to the priest the right to have and express political opinions, the right to approve or disapprove public men and their acts and to instruct the people in what he believes to be their duty? In the name of what principle, should he not have the right to say that, if I am elected, religion will be endangered, when I have the right to say that if my adversary is elected, the State will be endangered? Why should the priest not have the right to say that, if I am elected, religion will be inevitably destroyed, when I have the right to say that, if my adversary is elected, the State will go into bankruptcy? No, let the priest speak and preach, as he thinks best; such is his right and no Canadian Liberal will dispute that right.

Our constitution invites all citizens to take part in the direction of the affairs of the State; it makes no exception of any person. Each one has the right not only to express his opinion, but to influence, if he can, by the expression of his opinion, the opinion of his fellow citizens. This right exists for all and there can be no reason why the priest should be deprived of it. I am here to speak my whole mind and I may add that I am far from finding opportune the intervention of the clergy in the domain of politics, as it has been exercised for some years. I believe on the contrary that, from the standpoint of the respect due to his character, the priest has every thing to lose by meddling in the ordinary questions of politics: still his right to do so is indisputable and, if he thinks proper to use it, our duty, as Liberals,is to guarantee it to him against all denial.

This right, however, is not unlimited. We have no absolute rights amongst us. The rights of each man,in our state of society, end precisely at the point where they encroach upon the rights of others.

The right of interference in politics finishes at the spot where it encroaches on the elector's independence.

The constitution of the country rests on the freely expressed wish of each elector. It intends that each elector shall cast his vote freely and willingly as he deems best. If the greatest number of the electors of a country are actually of an opinion and that, owing to the influence exercised upon them by one or more men or owing to words they have heard or writings they have read, their opinion changes,there is nothing in the circumstance but what is perfectly legitimate. Although the opinion they express is different from the one they would have expressed without such intervention, still it is the one they desire to express conscienciously, and the constitution meets with its entire application. If, however, notwithstanding all reasoning, the opinion of the electors remains the same, but that, by intimidation or fraud, they are

forced to vote differently, the opinion which they express is not their opinion, and the constitution is violated. As I have already said, the constitution intends that each one's opinion shall be freely expressed as he understands it at the moment of expression, and the collective reunion of the individual opinions, freely expressed, forms the government of the country.

The law watches with so jealous an eye the free expression of the elector's opinion as it really is that, if in a constituency the opinion expressed by a single one of the electors is not his real opinion, but an opinion forced from him by fear, fraud or corruption, the election must be annulled.

It is therefore perfectly legitimate to alter the elector's opinion by argument and all other means of persuasion, but never by intimidation. As a matter of fact, persuasion changes the elector's conviction; intimidation does not. When, by persuasion, you have changed the elector's conviction, the opinion he expresses is his own opinion; but when, by terror, you force him to vote, the opinion he expresses is your opinion; remove the cause of his fear and he will then express another opinion, which it his own.

Now, it will be understood, if the opinion expressed by the majority of the electors is not their real opinion, but an opinion snatched from them by fraud, by threats or by corruption, the constitution is violated and you have not the government of the majority, but the government of a minority. Well, if such a state of things continues and is repeated, if, after each election, the will expressed is not the real will of the country, once more you do violence to the constitution, responsible government is no longer anything but an empty name and, sooner or later, here as elsewhere, the pressure will culminate in explosion, violence and ruin.

But people are not wanting who say that the clergy have a right to dictate to the people what are its duties. I simply answer that we are here under

the government of the Queen of England, under the authority of a constitution which was granted to us as an act of justice, and that, if the exercise of the rights which you claim is to have for effect the impeding of the constitution and our exposure to all the consequences of such an act, then the clergy themselves would not want it.

I am not one of those who parade themselves as friends and champions of the clergy. However, I say this: like the most of my young fellow countrymen, I have been reared among priests and among young men who have become priests. I flatter myself that I have among them some sincere friends and to them at least, I can and I do say: see, if there is under the sun a country happier than ours; see, if there is under the sun a country where the Catholic church is freer or more privileged than it is here. Why, then, should you, by claiming rights incompatible with our state of society, expose this country to agitations, of which it is impossible to foresee the consequences?

But I address myself to all my fellow countrymen without distinction and I say to them:

We are a free and happy people; and we are so owing to the liberal institutions by which we are governed, institutions which we owe to the exertions of our forefathers and the wisdom of the mother country.

The policy of the Liberal party is to protect those institutions, to defend and spread them, and, under the sway of those institutions, to develop the country's latent resources. That is the policy of the Liberal party and it has no other.

Now, to properly estimate all the value of the institutions by which we are ruled to day, let us compare the present state of the country with what it was before they were granted to us.

Forty years ago the country was in a state of feverish commotion, a prey to an agitation which, a few months later, broke out in rebellion. The British crown was only maintained in the country by the force of

powder and ball. And yet what were our predecessors seeking? They were asking for nothing more than the institutions which we have at present; those institutions were granted to us and loyally applied; and see the result; the British flag floats over the old citadel of Quebec; it floats to-night over our heads, without a single English soldier in the country to defend it, its sole defence resting in the gratitude, which we owe it for our freedom and the security which we have found under its folds.

Where is the Canadian who, comparing his country with even the freest countries, would not feel proud of the institutions which protect him?

Where is the Canadian who, passing through the streets of this old city and reaching the monument raised a few steps from here to the memory of the two brave men, who died on the same field of battle while contending for empire in Canada, would not feel proud of his country?

In what other country, under the sun, can you find a similar monument reared to the memory of the conquered as well as of the conqueror? In what other country, under the sun, will you find the names of the conquered and the conqueror equally honored and occupying the same place in the respect of the population?

Gentlemen, when, in that last battle which is recalled by the Wolfe and Montcalm monument the iron hail was spreading death in the ranks of the French army; when the old heroes, whom victory had so often accompanied, saw at last victory snatched from them; when, stretched on the ground with their life-blood fast ebbing away, they saw, as the result of their defeat, Quebec in the hands of the enemy and the country forever lost; no doubt, their last thought was of their children, whom they were leaving without protection and without defence; no doubt, they pictured them as persecuted, enslaved, and humiliated, and then, it is reasonable to believe, they drew their last breath with a cry of despair.

But, if, on the other hand, Heaven had lifted the veil of the future from their dying eyes and enabled them for an instant, before these closed forever, to pierce what was hidden from their sight; if they could have seen their children free and happy, marching proudly in all spheres of society; if they could have seen, in the old cathedral, the seat of honor of the French governors occupied by a French governor; if they could have seen the church steeples rising in every valley from the shores of Gaspé to the prairies of the Red River; if they could have seen this old flag, which recalls the finest of their victories, carried triumphantly in all our public ceremonies; in fine, if they could have seen our free institutions, is it not permissible to think that their last breath would have been exhaled in a murmur of gratitude to Heaven and that they would have died consoled?

If the shades of these heroes still hover over this old city, for which they laid down their lives; if their shades hover to-night over the hall in which we are now assembled, it is free for us, Liberals, to think —at least we cherish the fond illusion,—that their sympathies are all with us.

— —

THE QUEBEC MINISTERIAL CRISIS IN 1878

MR. LAURIER'S REPLY TO THE DETRACTORS OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

On the 11th April, 1878, a few weeks after the dismissal of the De Boucherville Cabinet by Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, Sir John A Macdonald, then leader of the Opposition, made the following motion in the House of Commons:

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that the recent dismissal by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec of his Ministers was, under the circumstances, unwise and subversive of the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown since the concession of the principle of Responsible Government to the British North American Colonies."

This motion was rejected by a vote of 112 against 70, after a long debate, in the course of which Honorable Mr. Laurier took occasion to define the true principles professed by the Liberal party, as he had done in his lecture of the previous year at Quebec. There exists unfortunately only a feeble analysis of his speech, which we take from the *Hansard*:

Mr. Laurier said the hon. gentleman, who had just addressed the House, had endeavored to influence the question by casting upon the Liberal party of the province of Quebec what could be termed by no other name than foul slander. He commenced his remarks by quoting Mr. Thiers in favour of constitutional monarchy, in order to show that in the ranks of the Liberal party in Quebec there were men opposed to constitutional government. Such an accusation coming from the member for Terrebonne surprised him very much. It surprised him that a man, whom he believed to be the fairest Conservative in Quebec,

should have made use of such language. Yet it was not surprising, for it was only a continuation of the tactics which had been used, again and again, in the province of Quebec for the last twenty-five years, and the day had not yet dawned in that province when it had been their good fortune to discuss any public question upon its merits. When they were discussing any question, his party were always met with the taunt

THAT THEY WERE COMMUNISTS

or something of that kind. He defied the hon. gentleman, or any of his followers, to quote any utterance by any member of the Liberal party of Quebec that could justify such an accusation. They were Liberal in the sense in which Liberalism was regarded in England. It had always been the tactics of the hon. gentlemen to throw that accusation against them, it sounded well to the people; it had been repeated again and again, and would be all through the elections. Upon this question, he would not charge the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), with a deliberate falsehood, but he would make a countercharge. While the hon. gentleman charged them with being Communists, he (Mr. Laurier) charged the party which the hon. gentleman led with being

HOSTILE TO THE PRINCIPLES

of responsible government; and he made this charge advisedly. Its doctrines could be judged by the tone of its press. He could cite from articles of their most authorized organs in which the principles of responsible government were condemned. It was well known that the French charter of 1830 was a close copy of the English constitution. And yet, what was the opinion which a Conservative paper put upon that constitution in France?

Under the charter of 1830, the Crown was in a most humi-

liating position, and Louis Philippe was reduced to extract from the majority, by means of corruption, the principle of authority which had been taken from the Crown.

This was the estimation in which honorable gentlemen opposite held the British constitution, of which the French constitution of 1830 was a copy. But it might be said that this was simply an opinion as to its applicability to the French people. He knew this defence was made. If that were the argument, he would simply answer that in these quotations the honorable gentlemen opposite showed what were their ideas of responsible government. But he could give them, also, what were the opinions at this very moment of those who stood here as the champions of responsible government. He would cite from an article published in one of their leading organs, *Le Courrier du Canada*, on the 13th March last:

The electoral contest is now engaged in everywhere, and we know that, under the circumstances, it may be extremely violent. These elections will be followed by the Federal elections, these will be followed by school elections, and these by municipal elections; in fact, we have elections everywhere. We may, therefore, consider that for a long time electoral agitation will be permanent. The friends of tranquillity are, for good reasons, frightened at the system of the age. We must drink the cup to the dregs. Everything indicates that elections will continue to become more and more frequent; Liberalism is fond of elections. These elections will increase agitation. When we speak of Liberalism, we speak of Liberalism in Canada, for here as well as elsewhere it has recorded on its programme universal suffrage. This is what the Liberals call the vindication of the rights of the people. For this prerogative, the poor working man is bound to give away many hours from his labor.

Here was an organ of Conservative opinion in Lower Canada stating that this system of responsible government was an invention of the devil. On the floor of Parliament the Conservative party stood as the champions of free responsible government; in the press

THEY OPENLY DENOUNCED

this same system. How was it that such a contradiction existed? There was in that article one paragraph which gave the key to the whole mystery. It was a part of the system which had been always carried out against the Liberal party in Lower Canada. On the floor of this House, they palmed themselves off as champions of free responsible government, and, in the press, they denounced the same system with the object of merely making political capital against the Liberal party. He was right in charging the party with being decidedly hostile to the form of responsible government under which they lived. Of course, they would not say so openly on the floor of this House; he did not expect any of those gentlemen to repudiate the language made use of in their press; but, if they were as devoted as they pretended to be to the principles of responsible government,

WAS IT NOT THEIR BOUNDEN DUTY

to repudiate such language? They had never repudiated it.

Mr. Baby :—Did you repudiate Dessaulles' doctrine about annexation?

Mr. Laurier said, if he were to name all the gentlemen who, at one time, held annexationist views, he would find many among the honorable gentlemen opposite.

Several honorable members : —No; name them!

Mr. Laurier said he could cite many, but this was an old and dead issue. There was another organ of public opinion, the *Journal des Trois Rivières*, upon which he could not, unfortunately, lay his hands just then, as it was not received in the Library, in which honorable gentlemen would remember, a series of articles appeared, some four or five years ago, in support of the doctrine that the minority was not bound by the decree of the majority. Under the

constitution under which we live, the decrees of the majority, when expressed in the proper channels and in the proper form, must be respected by the minority. He did not mean to say the majority would not fall into error, but the remedies for errors were provided by the constitution. Then it became the duty of the minority to agitate and have this error corrected, and he believed they could do it and that justice would always in the end prevail. He held that this was

TRUE AND SOUND DOCTRINE ;

but, in one of the papers of the honorable gentlemen opposite, a series of articles was published to establish the proposition that if a by-law was passed by the majority it would not be binding on the minority, The circumstance which gave rise to the articles was this : a by-law had been passed by a county, according to the terms of the law, granting a bonus to the North Shore Railway, upon a vote of the majority. These articles claimed that the by-law was not binding upon the minority who voted against it, but only on the majority who voted for it. Such language as that was used under a free responsible government by those who now taunted the Liberal party with being Communists. Strange to say, the late Quebec Government passed a law which had not been sanctioned, in which, on frivolous pretexts, they compelled every one to pay the bonuses, whether the conditions were complied with or not. These gentlemen were here as the champions of responsible government upon the floor of Parliament and at the same time, in the country, they were attacking it with their own press and with all the other weapons at their hands. In the country, they denounced the present system of responsible government; on the floor of Parliament they defended it. Just hearken to their language to-day. They the champions of civil rights; they the apostles of the doctrine that all royal power is superior to the people; they this time reduced the representative

of the Crown in the province of Quebec to a mere automaton, who had nothing to do but what he was told by his Ministers. His (Mr. Laurier's) party were Liberal; they contended that the majority must govern; that the will of the people must pre vail, and that the Crown had its rights as well as the people theirs. The best regulated State was the State in which the rights of the Crown and the rights of the people were clearly defined and greatly respected. This was not the doctrine of honorable gentlemen opposite. In connection with this he claimed that it was neither their duty nor their province to criticize the conduct of Mr Letellier.

HIS PROPER JUDGES

were the people of the province of Quebec. He would not follow the honorable gentleman in the controversy respecting the action of Mr. Letellier; but would leave it to the judgment of the people. But he would say this: that it would be the most dangerous principle and the most serious blow that could be effected against our institutions if the proposed motion were carried. The carrying out of this proposition would be a direct invasion of the Federal system under which we lived. It was a well known fact that had the province of Quebec not represented a minority of a different creed, race and language, the union would not have been a Federal one. It was the federative system that gave to the province of Quebec its autonomy. He was especially jealous to keep up the principles of the Federal system under which we lived. He submitted that the Dominion Government had no power to interfere with a matter which affected the provincial constitution of Quebec alone. It would be a most dangerous principle for this Parliament to interfere. He agreed with the honorable leader of the Opposition when he said that the provinces were free and responsible governments. If that proposition was a correct one, even though a great wrong had been com-

mitted against the people of Quebec, was it not a fact that they had

THE REMEDY IN THEIR OWN HANDS,

if they did not approve of the conduct of the late Government? It would, indeed, be better that a wrong committed in the Province of Quebec should remain than that the system of federal government should be jeopardized. He did not mean to lay down the proposition that no matter what changes might take place in the government of Quebec, Parliament should not interfere; he frankly admitted that a wrong might perchance be committed in the province of Quebec which would justify this Parliament to step in. It would certainly be the duty of the Dominion Government to interfere in order to redress a wrong which the people could not themselves remedy. But if this power was exercised on slight grounds, what would become of our Federal machinery which they had been at such pain to establish? He submitted that the resolution placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker would, if carried, be an invasion of the rights of the people of Quebec. But honorable gentlemen opposite said that the rights of the people of Quebec had been trifled with and invaded by the action of the Lieutenant-Governor. Well, as he had already pointed out, the people of Quebec could remedy the evil themselves by overthrowing the present legal advisers of the Crown. It was not for this Parliament to say whether the Lieutenant-Governor had acted judiciously or injudiciously, wisely or unwisely—that was a question which would be decided afterwards.

Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's Act

ANOTHER MOTION OF CENSURE

A PLEA WHICH SUMS UP THE WHOLE QUESTION

In 1879, the Conservatives, who had just recaptured power at Ottawa, returned to the charge against the late Letellier de St Just. But, this time, it was not Sir John, who had become Prime Minister, who proposed the censure; it was Mr. Mousseau, a public man since disappeared from the world's stage, who took up the Macdonald motion of the previous session. Mr. Laurier, on this occasion, delivered a speech which sums up admirably the whole question.

(*HOUSE OF COMMONS*)

SITTING OF THE 12TH MARCH, 1879

MR. SPEAKER,

I do not rise with the view to answer the speech of the honorable member for Lincoln, because I do not see anything in his speech to be answered. When the honorable gentleman first began his speech, I took a blank sheet of paper and a pen to take up any points made against the Opposition in this House; but I had not occasion to use my instrument at all. The first part of his speech was on subjects which had

no reference to the motion before the House, and the last part of it, which had reference to the motion before the House, has been answered time and again. I also waited for some time to see if any of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches would rise to tell us what would be the policy of the Government on this question. Perhaps the fact that the motion which is now before the House was last year presented by the leader of the Opposition, the present Premier of this Government, and is not renewed by him now, may be taken as some evidence by the House that, whatever may be the future conduct of the Government upon this question, if their own feelings had been followed, this matter would not have come a second time before this House. I beg to remind the House of this, that the motion which was made last session,

THIS IDENTICAL MOTION

which we have now before us, was negatived by a large majority of this House. I say, at the outset, when this motion was negatived by a large majority of this House, the majority did not then assert that the principle involved in this motion was not true any more than they would assert that it was true; they did not assert that the conduct of Mr. Letellier was wise any more than it was unwise; that it was constitutional any more than it was unconstitutional. The House carefully and distinctly abstained from pronouncing any opinion upon the conduct of Mr. Letellier. The House held, at the time, that there was no occasion for it to interfere in this matter, and that, under the regime under which we now live, the provinces are free and independent, not only one of the other, but of the central power as well. This House affirmed that, whenever any provincial differences arise, they should be settled by the application of the principles of responsible government with which every province is endowed, and decided that this

matter, which affected solely the interests of the people of Quebec, should be left to their judgment,

AND TO THEM ALONE

it appertained to decide whether or not the act of Mr Letellier was wise and constitutional. At hat time, the people of the province of Quebec had not decided upon it; they had just been seized of the question. The elections had not yet taken place, but were in progress; they had since taken place, and, whatever may be said by honorable gentlemen opposite, the result had been to uphold the action of Mr Letellier.

Several honorable members:—No, no.

Mr. Laurier: — What are you here for, if you say no? If your Government had not been defeated, why should you be before this House? Your very motion is the best evidence of what I say. If your course had been supported by the people, you would not seek, at the hands of this House, the vengeance which you are now seeking. I affirm what I have already said, that the people of the province of Quebec, who alone are interested in this question, have decided that, in their opinion, whether that be right or wrong, the act of Mr. Letellier was just and constitutional. If such be the case, if this question has already been once before the House, if this House has already declined to interfere in this matter, and decided to leave it entirely in the hands of the people of Quebec, and if the people of the province of Quebec have decided upon it, is it not but proper that this question should be laid at rest forever before this House? I do not hesitate to say that this matter would have forever remained at rest before this House, had it not been for another event which has since taken place, namely, the Dominion elections. We have had it from the mouths of honorable gentlemen opposite. The result of the general elections has been to displace the majority from the Liberal to the Conservative ranks, and now that a new element is brought into the House, a new

attempt is made to get the new majority to do what the old majority would not do,

TO SUBSTITUTE THE WILL OF THE DOMINION

for the will of the province of Quebec, Even without the language that fell from the lips of some honorable gentlemen opposite, I would have taken this motion as a slur upon the majority of the former House. The idea conveyed by it, not, it is true, in language, but as clearly as if expressed in words, is that the Liberal majority, which sat on the other side of the House last year, deliberately refused to do justice in the premises; that, since the party ousted from power at Quebec happened to be the Conservative party, and the party called to power happened to be the Liberal party, the Liberal majority in this House allowed their better judgment to be biassed by their political feelings. As one of that majority which ruled last session, I do not object that this accusation should be thrown at us, provided that that the same standard of measure should be applied this time again. And, if this motion is to be affirmed, if the Conservative majority in this House is to do what the Liberal majority would not do last year, if they are going

TO RIDE OVER THE PROVINCES,

if either the majority which insisted last year upon respecting the right of the provinces to self-government, or the majority which this year may infringe upon these rights; if either majority, I say, are to be branded as being actuated by improper motives, I have no objection to that, and we will cheerfully await the judgment of impartial men and impartial history. Before going further, let me make one observation. The elections in the province of Quebec last year took place upon the issue raised by the act of Mr Letellier, and upon no other issue. At the very outset of the campaign, in a speech delivered in the

town of Levis, by Mr Chapleau, the present leader of the Opposition in Quebec, he stated that this question of the dismissal of the Ministry by Mr Letellier was the only question which the people should look at. He used very forcible language. I have not the speech before me, but I kept the exact words in my memory, which has not failed me. He put it, that whatever might have been their failings as Ministers, even if they had been defaulters and thieves, they had been dismissed improperly and illegally, and it was the duty of the people of Quebec to restore them to the place from which they had been dismissed. On the other hand, Mr Joly, the present leader of the Government, accepted the issue upon that ground alone. He said to the people that he fully endorsed

AND ACCEPTED THE RESPONSIBILITY

of the act of Mr. Letellier—that it was an extraordinary act, but that it was justified and called for by the circumstances of the case. As I stated, the result was that the act of Mr. Letellier was upheld. I need not remind this House that every one of us holds his seat upon an issue in the consideration of which the question now before the House did not count for anything. I heard the honorable gentlemen from Cardwell say that this question had been voted upon, at least in the province of Quebec, on the 17th September. I take issue with this. This is the first intimation I have ever had of it. Whatever may have taken place in the province of Quebec, I am quite sure it never was discussed in the other provinces. Let me now ask it of honorable gentlemen from the sister provinces; let me appeal to their fairness and justice, even if this House had the authority to interfere in this matter, would it be fair and just to the province of Quebec for this House to interfere in the matter, since the people of the province of Quebec are alone affected by this act; since they alone are to suffer from it, if it has been unwise; since they alone are to suffer from it, if it be

unwise; since they alone are to benefit from it, if it be wise; since they have held it, in their estimation, to be wise, would it be just, would it be wise,

WOULD IT BE CONSTITUTIONAL

for gentlemen of the other provinces to condemn what those interested in it have approved? I might ask it also of my more immediate countrymen, of those of fellow-origin and fellow language; I might ask them if their conduct, on the occasion, is patriotic? Is it patriotic in them to ask the aid of the sister provinces, since their views have not prevailed at the polls, in order, under their united action, to crush the expressed will of their own province? What they are driving at is to obtain a mere party triumph, and, to do that, they are ready to sacrifice the vested rights of their native province. In order to obtain a mere party triumph, they ask the aid and co-operation of a foreign power,—because I hold that the Federal power, in purely provincial matters, is a foreign power—they ask the aid of a foreign power, forgetting that, whenever a party in any country, in order to obtain a triumph over a rival party, calls in the aid and co-operation of a foreign power, the invariable consequence has always been

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF THE WHOLE COUNTRY,

I do not apprehend that so fatal a result would follow from the act of honorable gentlemen opposite, but the result would be that a breach would be opened in the principle which we have always looked upon as the bulwark of our provincial liberties. And just look at the justice which is meted to Mr. Letellier in this case! Last year, when the motion was brought up, and when it was asked that it should be brought in the shape of a substantial motion, so that it might be open to an amendment, they would not do so, but insisted on bringing on the motion for the House to

go into committee of supply, so that the true resolution at which the House might have arrived was prevented from going on the journals of the House. And this time, as soon as the motion is made, my honorable friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) stands up and moves the previous question. It is true, in moving the previous question, he was kind enough to say that he did not mean to stifle this question; and he was also so strict as to give a precedent to show that the moving of the previous question would not prevent free discussion. What then did he want to prevent? It was that the opinion elicited by this free discussion should not go down upon the journals of the House. He knew that the motion could be met successfully with an amendment which, perhaps, might have been carried by a majority of the House, and, in order to get a verdict, *coûte que coûte*, against Mr. Letellier, he prevented

THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AMENDMENT

being made. No doubt, a good many gentlemen from our sister provinces have given this question but little attention and the papers brought down a very indifferent perusal, and have derived their knowledge of the case mostly from the indictment of Mr. Letellier drawn yesterday and to-day. Perhaps they think he has perpetrated a great crime, and proved false to the cause of liberty. If they look at those papers, however, they will find there is another side to the picture which has been exhibited to them. They will find that the honorable gentlemen who have dilated at such length on the conduct of Mr. Letellier, might have dilated, at some length also, on the conduct of his advisers; they will find that, if the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was extraordinary, the conduct of his advisers was still more extraordinary; they will find that, if the conduct of Mr. Letellier has but few precedents in British parliamentary history, that of his advisers has none at all. They will find that

his advisers systematically trampled down the royal prerogative, the liberty of the people, and the civil rights of the people; that the government of Quebec was fast falling

INTO THE HANDS OF AN OLIGARCHY,

which completely disregarded the royal authority, and remembered the people only to put new burdens upon it. They will find that this oligarchy was itself ruled by rings, the greedy appetite of which had to be fed from the public treasury; and that the treasury had to be replenished by the people at the price of their civil liberty; that since the days of king John no such attempt was ever made on the liberty and civil rights of the people in any part of the British empire. Mr Letellier, to the long array of charges against him, might answer in the language of the old Roman, who, being brought to the forum to answer an accusation, merely said: "I swear I have saved the country." But the parallel could not go any further; the historical character to whom I have just alluded had committed a crime, while Mr Letellier has committed no crime.

HE EXERCISED A RIGHT

he had the abstract power to exercise. It is said the exercise of it was unwise; but, in the estimation of the people of Quebec, that unwise act has saved the country. This opinion is not held simply by a political party, but is shared by the great majority of the people which no one knows better than the Premier himself. He is aware that thousands who voted for him in the late elections supported Mr Letellier's view and his present Ministers, and would do so again. Before I dismiss this branch of the subject, I will call your attention to the blue-book containing the petition of Messrs. Chapleau, Angers, and Church, asking for his removal. I call attention to this because it may serve

to show the character of Mr Letellier's advisers, and the justice he must have received from them. They set forth that:

> In his communication to his Excellency the Governor-General, respecting the aforesaid dismissal, Mr Letellier made statements unsupported by and in contradiction with the official documents, to which they relate, and that, in the opinion of the undersigned, viz, the petitioners, such erroneous statements could not have been made by mistake or failure of memory.

No more grievous charge could be made against any gentleman brought up under British ideas of honour, according to which a gentleman's word is sacred. Now, what were the facts? These statements were submitted in connection with those of Mr Letellier in his memorial to Lord Dufferin, to the effect that his authority had always been completely

DISREGARDED BY HIS ADVISERS,

and, as an illustration of his charge, he instanced two proclamations which had been published without his signature. The petitioners allege that statement is untrue, as they say Mr. Letellier well knew, and that, in fact, the proclamations, when they were published, bore his signature. What is Mr. Letellier's answer to this charge of wilfully and designedly alleging an untruth? He says his attention was called to the publication of those proclamations by his private secretary; that, thereupon, he wrote to Mr. De Boucherville, who came and ackowledged the error, and that, in his presence, and in order to set the matter right, he appended his signature to the original proclamations, Here is a complete defence, which, I insist, shows the bad faith of the traducers of Mr. Letellier. If the charge against him had been true, they were bound, in honour, to call the attention of the House and His Excellency to the fact, and to demand the evidence of Mr. De Boucherville, since Mr. Letellier gave him as having been witness to

his appending his signature to the proclamations. If they could not have maintained their charge, they were bound to admit their error. Their rejoinder was unworthy of leaders of a great party; their answer was a mere quibbling of lawyers, such as would not be expected from men of honour. They say in their reply to his explanations :

> Dealing with that part of the Lieutenant-Governor's answer which bears upon one of the charges contained in the petition, and in which he states in contradiction to official and authentic documents, that he signed the proclamations referred to after their publication, the undersigned represent that this explanation is of no value, in presence of the facts established by the proclamations bearing his signature, and the dates at which they were signed. It is difficult to understand how the Lieutenant-Governor can bear evidence against his own signature, and expect that his statement upon the point can be credited.

In their rejoinder, they do not reaffirm their accusation, viz., that the proclamations were signed before their publication, but they say that Mr. Letellie could not be admitted to affirm the fact that he had only signed them afterwards. If they had been in earnest in this, they would have called for Mr. De Boucherville's evidence ; and now, when it appears that Mr. Letellier signed the proclamations *ex post facto*, his enemies attempt to deny him the benefit of the fact, and charge him with an untruth. If the charge made against Mr. Letellier had been true, it would have been of the most damaging character, but, being not true, the charge must redound with equal force against his traducers. But, whether Mr. Letellier's action was constitutional or not, a far more important question, to my mind now arises :

HAS THIS HOUSE AUTHORITY

to enquire into that act and condemn it ? If this motion was proposed simply to elicit a purely abstract

expression of opinion which would remain barren of result, we might have discussed it to our heart's content, just as we might discuss any other question which any honorable gentleman might choose to bring; just as we might discuss the recent events in France and the causes which led to Marshal MacMahon resigning the presidency. But, if this motion is intended to be, as indeed it is, a pregnant motion, if it is to be followed up, if passed, by the censure and dismissal of Mr. Letellier, then I submit respectfully and earnestly that this House has no authority to enquire into and condemn his conduct. I affirm that proposition and invite its discussion. Of course, I would not go the length of saying that we never could in any case interfere in provincial matters, and no honorable gentleman on the other side of the House will affirm that we would have that right of interfering in every case. Since then, we will agree that this House has the power to interfere

IN SOME CASES, NOT IN ALL;

where is the land-mark to be found, where is the line to be drawn, up to which it must be legitimate for this House to interfere and beyond which it would be criminal for it to do so. I think the answer has been given by the House on several occasions. The Constitutional Act gives the Federal Executive the power of disallowing provincial laws. This power being given to the Executive, it follows that the exercise of it is brought within the jurisdiction of this House, to which the Executive is responsible. The doctrine is now well settled that this power of disallowing provincial laws is to be confined to those cases only where Provincial Legislatures may have stepped beyond their jurisdiction into prohibited ground; that this power is to be exercised only for the protection of Imperial or Federal rights which may have been invaded by Provincial Legislatures, but never to afford relief to any section of the community in

the province which may deem itsely aggrieved by that legislation. The doctrine is now well settled that, if Provincial Legislatures keep within the jurisdiction which is allotted to them by the constitution, however odious their laws may be, however despotic and tyrannical, however desirous both the Executive and the Government might be of affording relief against such laws, yet this House will not interfere, because interference in such cases would be

A VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE,

and, in all such cases, the aggrieved portion of the community must seek, and can find its relief in the application of the principle of responsible government. The people can agitate and they can vote, and a people who can vote has in its hands the instrument whereby to redress all its grievances, the weapon to avenge all its wrongs; and those who believe, as I do, in the efficacity of responsible government know that these weapons are amply adequate, and that, with them, truth and justice will prevail in the end. If such be the rule for legislative acts, such must be the rule with regard to administration, because administrative acts are, as legislative acts, subject to the judgment of the people, who may pronounce upon them in a regular way. Now, as regards the Lieutenant-Governor, under the constitution, the laws says that he shall be removable for cause; but what can cause be? I believe that these causes of removal can well be offences of a personal character, but never offences connected with the discharge of duties of an official character. If, for instance, the Lieutenant-Governor, by some grossly dishonourable conduct, brings the dignity of the Crown into contumely, this and similar offences might be causes of removal; but, if he sticks within the circle of his functions, however tyrannical his acts may be, he is not removable, because he is

COVERED BY MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY.

He is amenable to the people, who can set him right, if they believe him wrong, and undo what he has done. If it were otherwise, if the House had power to interfere because the Lieutenant-Governor had erred in the discharge of his official duty, it would be an infringement on the principles of responsible government and an abuse of Federal rights. It has been stated, ever since this discussion has been commenced, that the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec acted arbitrarily, without the advice of his constitutional advisers. If such be the opinion of this House, it was not the opinion of the Legislature of Quebec. The Legislature of Quebec on several occasions expressed its opinion that the act of Mr Letellier was within the exercise of his functions, and covered by Ministerial responsibility. The question has been brought several times before the House, and the opinion in each case has been precisely the same, On the 8th March last, a motion was made for a petition against Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, to be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, the Senate and House of Commons. A point of order was raised upon the ground that the petition was injurious to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. The Speaker, on that occasion, gave the following ruling:

It is an essential principle of monarchical constitutional government that the Crown can commit no wrong. The Lieutenant-Governor represents the Crown in our Legislatures. It is therefore necessary that there should be, near the Sovereign, near the Lieutenant-Governor, advisers, Ministers, who always bear the responsibility which can never be laid on the Crown, and to the continuance of that responsibility there can be no limit. And although use is made of the term "Lieutenant-Governor" in the Adresses, as also in the measures submitted to the House, from the very nature of our constitution these words are addressed only to the Ministers who are responsible to the Assembly. The person even of the Sovereign, in his representative, is never brought in question. In the present case, the complaints contained, in the motion, apply

to the advisers of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor,—and I must, therefore, declare it in order.

And to his ruling,

BOTH SIDES OF THE HOUSE ASSENTED.

In the month of June last, the Legislative Council of Quebec—and I may say that there is not a more Conservative body under the sun —declared the same doctrine; it was moved and agreed to "That His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was advised to dismiss his Ministers in March last, at a time when they enjoyed the confidence of both branches of the Legislature". Now, here we have an opinion of both branches of the Legislature of Quebec that Mr Letellier was fully covered by Ministerial responsibility. I ask, therefore, if the act of Mr Letellier, so covered by Ministerial responsibility, is an act subject to the censure of this House? Can Mr Letellier be responsible at once to his Ministers, who are responsible to the House of Assembly, and at the same time to the House of Commons? But it will be said that the responsibility of Mr Letellier's Ministers is a pure fiction. This fiction, however, is the very life of responsible government. If you do not acknowledge it this time, what will prevent you from acknowledging it elsewhere? If you acknowledge it this time, you are bound to follow it to its legitimate consequence, which is

THE JUDGMENT OF THE PEOPLE

and no other judgment. Now, it has been said that Mr Letellier's act has not been approved by the people. I desire now to say a few words on this question. In approaching this subject, I feel a good deal like a professor of a college, who once said he wanted to prove, by a long disquisition, the light of the sun at noon. One pupil at once said it was sufficient for him to look at the sun. In a like manner, it will perhaps

be sufficient for honorable gentlemen to look at what now exists in the province of Quebec, in order to be satisfied that Mr Letellier's Government had a majority. When a vote of want of confidence was brought against the Joly Government, upon the Address, it is true that the motion was carried by a vote of 32 to 31. This vote, however, was taken not in a full House, and at that time another motion was immediately brought in, affirming the confidence of the people in the new Government, which motion was affirmed in a full House. But that was not yet the best evidence. The best evidence is this: On the 8th March, Mr Angers, the ex-Attorney-General, moved the following amendment to the Supply Bill :—

> That the Bill be not now read: but that the reading thereof be suspended until such time as justice shall have been rendered to the majority of this House, in as much as, when the resolutions upon which the said Bill is based were adopted, the Cabinet charged with the public business enjoyed the confidence of this House and of the country, whilst the present Administration does not possess that confidence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was

THE TRUE CONSTITUTIONAL REMEDY.

If an injustice had been done, there was a true legal remedy in the hands of the province. If the supplies had been refused, Mr. Letellier would have been compelled to take back his old Government or resign his position. But, Sir, when the new House, fresh from the people, elected upon this very issue, met again, the supplies were voted. Is there a man in this House who will say that justice has not been done to the late Government of Quebec, since they themselves have been condemned by the tribunal to which they appealed? I hold, Sir, that this motion, now in your hands, cannot be carried if there is any sense of justice in the House. The premises of the motion do not warrant the conclusion. In the language of the mover

and sequelae. It is expected this motion is to be a vote of censure on Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, to be promptly followed by dismissal. If Mr. Letellier had committed a crime, what more could you do? He is not charged with having acted arbitrarily, but only with having committed an unwise act. Who would believe that an unwise act deserves such punishment as dismissal? If the motion is carried, it will be the first time a great deliberative body shall have attempted to punish a man for an act which is represented as nothing but an error.

AND NOT A WILFUL CRIME.

The matter in dispute at the present time is simply relating to the exercise of the prerogative. Last year, the honorable the Premier did not dispute the prerogative, but he merely argued that the exercise of it was, in all cases, unconstitutional. The doctrine of honorable gentlemen opposite has never yet been formally recorded in the British Parliament, and all the authorities have been, so far, contrary to it. There are numerous authorities to show that the Sovereign, whatever his name be, can dismiss his Ministers for cause, and I would beg upon this subject to cite the opinion of Lord Brougham. He said this:

> If they were torn among themselves by endless dissensions, if they differed from the Sovereign, if their measures were evidently ruinous, if dishonour abroad and disaster at home marked the whole tenour of their government, any of these might be constitutional grounds for their dismissal: and, above all, if there happened to be a general feeling of distrust, and disapprobation throughout the country, that would be a sufficient ground for such a procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose Mr. Letellier had this authority in view when he dismissed his Ministry. I suppose he had in view this, that he could dismiss his Ministry if there happened to be a general feeling of distrust and disapprobation in the country, and

that there was a general feeling of distrust and disapprobation, the result of the appeal to the country has shown; the fact that the dismissed gentlemen came back from the elections in an actual minority was sufficient evidence of it. If Mr Letellier acted upon this authority to justify him in what he did, who will dare to censure him? But it is insisted that he was not justified in the exercise of the prerogative. This doctrine, however, has not yet been found recorded in the journals of the House of Commons of England. Therefore, I say, Mr. Letellier has acted

IN GOOD FAITH,

and he has good authority to do what he did. If he acted in good faith, though he may have acted unwisely and unconstitutionally, will there be found a majority in this House to say this man is to be censured and dismissed because he may have acted unwisely, Again, I appeal to the sense of justice and of fairness of honorable gentlemen from the sister provinces. It may be that upon this occasion, I would not be justified in making this appeal, but they have been appealed to in the name of liberty, and it is also in the name of liberty that I appeal to them. It would be a very serious thing for this House to step beyond its jurisdiction. I have cited from Lord Brougham to show that the action of Mr. Letellier was justified. You may say that, though he has followed the opinion of Lord Brougham, he has acted unwisely. So be it. He has appealed to the people and you may say the people have acted unwisely. I say, so be it again. But what right have you

TO SUBSTITUTE YOUR WISDOM

for the wisdom of the people of Quebec? It may be that our notions of right and wrong may not be equal to the standard of other provinces, though I am not prepared to admit that. But, whatever may be our

standard in this respect, whether low or high, what I ask in the name of the province to which I belong is that we should be governed according to our own standard—that we should be allowed the privilege of being badly governed, if being governed by ourselves meant bad government, but, at all events, to be governed by ourselves. This I ask in the name of liberty and self-government. There can be no doubt, Sir, of one thing, and that is that, if this motion is carried, it will be an invasion of the principles of federal government. It is a matter of regret, Sir, that this first attack upon federal government should have come from the province of Quebec. We were reminded, yesterday, by the honorable member for Halton, that, if we have to-day a federal form of government, it was owing in a great measure to the peculiar position of the province of Quebec, which is so different to the other provinces on account of its origin. I remember, at the time this system was put in operation, it was extolled to the sky for this very reason, that it gave to the people of Quebec a free, independent and untrammelled government. I have in my hands now a pamphlet which was issued in 1867, as the campaign sheet of the Conservative party of the province, for the first general election which took place after Confederation. The very first page of the pamphlet contains this explosion of enthusiasm:

Since the first of July, 1867, Lower Canada is now ruled under a new mode of government; it is no more Lower Canada, it is the province of Quebec; with this old French name, which has been restored to us, we have been given a French Governor, and all truly patriotic souls have thrilled with joy, and with a noble pride, when the newspapers have told us that the cannon in the old citadel of Quebec had roared its great voice to salute the first French Governor since 1760. We have been severed from Upper Canada; our name is the Province of Quebec; we have a French Canadian Governor, the second since the establishment of the country; we shall have our own Government and our own Parliament, where everything shall be done by and for the French Canadians, and in

the French language. One must be a renegade, or, what is the same thing, an annexationist, not to he moved to tears, not to feel the heart beating with an indescribable joy and with a very legitimate pride, at the thought of those glorious results of the patriotism and the indomitable energy of our statesment of our political leaders, who, one hundred years after the conquest of the country by England, have decided the latter, already impressed by our heroism and our loyalty, to restore us to ourselves, to restore to us our complete antonomy, and to confide the sacred trust of our national traditions to a Government chosen amongst us and composed of our own people.

Who do you think was the author of these lyrical strains ? Why it was no less than my honorable friend, the member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) *quantum mutatus ab illo.* Why the very man who thus rejoiced in 1867 that we had been restored to ourselves, that the sacred trust of our nationality had been confided to a Government of our own, that we had been separated from Upper Canada,—that very same man is now asking not only Upper Canada, but Nova Scotia, New-Brunswick, and the islands of the Atlantic, and the islands of the Pacific, to come to our aid and protect the sacred trust with which we had been entrusted. I remember, Mr. Speaker, the time when our alliance with Upper Canada was looked upon

AS THE BUGBEAR OF LOWER CANADA ;

it was looked upon as a demoniacal alliance,the source of all our evils. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the honorable member for Bagot was in earnest at the time when he so rejoiced at being relieved of an alliance with Upper Canada, and if he is in earnest now when he is asking the people of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New-Brunswick, Manitoba, and the other provinces, to take a part in our provincial affairs, he must feel somewhat like the man in the Scripture, who, having had a devil expelled from his body, had his body reentered by that same devil, and seven more. Now, Sir, if we, the people of Quebec, in whose favor this

Confederation has been established, are to be the first to attack it; if we are to be the first to lay a sacrilegeous hand upon the sacred ark of our liberties, how long can we expect that the system will be maintained? If we are to be the first to attack the federal system, the gun of the citadel at Quebec will have again to roar its great voice, to ring the death-knell of our provincial liberty. Sir, I need not repeat here that the federative union of these provinces was effected on that principle, on account of our peculiar position in the province of Quebec; for this we are indebted to our fellow citizens and to the mother country. I have often asserted, and I do so now, that we in Quebec will give way to none in our devotion to the mother country. There is not, on the face of the British empire, any class of Her Majesty's subjects

MORE DEVOTED TO THE BRITISH CROWN

than Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. The attachment we have for the British flag springs from a different cause from that of other British subjects. But, if the cause be different it is equally powerful. The attachment of our fellow-subjects of English origin springs from nature, while our attachment springs from the heart, from gratitude. We love the British flag, because under it we have found liberty and happiness. At the same time, we are the descendants of France, of that great nation which has placed itself, with England, at the head of modern civilization; we have derived from our origin peculiarities, characteristics, institutions, which we look upon as a national inheritance, and to which we fondly cling. I am bound to say, Sir, that our national institutions have ever been respected by our fellow-subjects of British origin, and I have no doubt that if the safeguards which we have in the federal system were removed, we would not experience from our fellow-citizens any other than the uniform

kind and generous treatment that we have always received. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the circumstances which existed in 1867

STILL EXIST

in 1878; those circumstances which induced our statesmen in 1867 to give us a federal form of government and not a legislative form still exist. Our legislators at that time thought it best to give us a federal form of government, more cumbersome and more expensive though it be, on account of the superior liberty which it gives to the people; and so long as the system shall be in operation, it will be the duty of every patriot to see that its principles are maintained in letter and spirit. Looking upon this motion as I do, and as, indeed, it must be looked upon, as an invasion of the fundamental principle of Confederation, I deem it to be the duty, upon this occasion, of every patriot to vote down this motion, which, if carried, would strike a most severe blow at the principle which binds these provinces together.

AN AFFECTING SCENE IN THE HOUSE

FUNERAL PANEGYRIC OF MR. HOLTON

On the 15th March, 1880, the Canadian Parliament was in mourning. Honorable Mr. Holton, one of the veterans and most distinguished figures of Canadian politics, had just died, and the Honorable Mr. Mackenzie, leader of the Opposition, attempted to panegyrize the memory of his old friend, but the task was too much for his strength, and, overcome with emotion, he requested Mr. Laurier to continue in his stead. It is this touching scene, which is depicted in the following extract from the *Debates*:

Mr Mackenzie :— I may say, Sir, that every one will join heartily in the very just remarks made by the honorable gentlemen opposite, and especially those who have long felt Mr. Holton's influence and known his excellent personal qualities. It is impossible for those who have long been his associates in public life, to estimate the great loss that has been sustained by his own party, by the whole House and by the country. I look upon his death at this moment, as it would be at any time, as a national calamity, and I feel that anything we can do, as his old colleagues in this House, to convey a sense of the impression we entertain of his great worth to the country, especially towards his bereaved family, should be done. I feel myself utterly unable to say..... .....

(The honorable gentlemen was here so overcome as to be unable to proceed.)

Mr Laurier :— If in view of this great calamity, this great national calamity, I were permitted to

speak with personal feelings, I would say that there is no one in this House who has more that myself reason to lament the death of Mr Holton. It was my privilege when I was a very young man to become a friend of Mr. Holton; and, from that moment up to the moment of his untimely death, many have been the occasions I have been able to appreciate the many noble qualities which endeared him to all those who came in contact with him. Members of this House who knew him only as a public man, who could judge of him only from what took place on the floor of the House, could appreciate his noble public qualities—they could appreciate the loftiness of mind that prompted him in everything he did—they could appreciate his entire sense of and devotion to duty, and the noble way in which he carried out his convictions of duty. They could appreciate also the vigour, exempt from bitterness, the moderation, exempt from weakness, with which he always defended his convictions. But they did not know the whole man. Those, on the other hand, who had the advantage of his personal friendship, knew that his private virtues were on a par with his public virtues. They could appreciate his unflinching attachment to his friends, his strong domestic affection, his large and tender heart, which revealed itself in everything whether great or small. He is now no more, and the best tribute that could be paid to his memory are the words which have fallen from the honorable First Minister's lips, "that his loss would be almost as much felt by those whose views he combated as by those whose opinions he upheld." Though engaged all his life in active political struggles, though all his life a strong party man, yet there is satisfaction in the thought that in this country, where political strife entails much bitterness, he has not left one single enemy behind him. His loss will be mourned alike by his friends and political foes, and all feel to-day that there is a gloom in this hall which darkens it and which must darken it not only for this session but for many sessions to

come. Mr. Speaker, by none will his loss be more keenly felt than by his fellow-countrymen of French origin. All French Canadians, irrespective of party, feel that a man has departed from among us who was the connecting link between many of the discordant elements in our midst. Our province has been the home of his choice and adoption. He had lived all his life among us, and mingled continually with us, and we always looked upon him as as one of ourselves. He was a man, who, in any station of life, would have naturally sided with the few against the many. His nature also prompted him on many occasions to side with us French Canadians; and his name in our province has become a household word, as also wherever the French language is spoken in Canada He is now no more, and all I can say is that his loss is irreparable.

A Toast to the French Academy

REPLY BY MR. LAURIER

THE FRENCH CANADIANS AND THEIR ANCIENT MOTHER COUNTRY.

Mr. Louis Frechette, the most eloquent of the French poets of America, had been honored with the crowning of one of his works by the French Academy. On this occasion, his Quebec admirers entertained him at a grand banquet on the 17th November, 1880. All the intelligence and the elite of the society of the ancient capital, without distinction of nationality were present. Called upon to reply to the toast of the French Academy, Mr. Laurier spoke as follows :

(Translation)

MR. CHAIRMAN
AND GENTLEMEN,

As the Chairman has announced, I have now the honor to propose the health of the French Academy. In inviting you to drink this toast, I do not think I am called upon to speak of the learned body, the focus of all the glories, the lawmaker of the language, and the supreme arbiter in literary matters. I mean the French Academy, as we know it. The Academy exists and that is sufficient ; it is needless to say anything more; its history is enough for us. But I would like to remind you of

the generosity with which the French Academy, setting aside its own positive rules and hearkening only to the claims of kindred, has recognized the title of our poët, Mr. Frechette, to be regarded as a Frenchman and admitted him, though an English subject, to participation in the competition open, according to the Academy's rules, to French citizens alone.

Who has read without emotion the account of the memorable meeting at which Mr. Frechette was crowned?

Who has, unmoved, pictured to himself that gathering of the representatives of all that is eminent in contemporary France, eagerly scanning the features of the brother from beyond the seas, whom the Academy was presenting to their sympathies and admiration?

Who has, without feeling the tears rise unbidden to his eyes, read the speech of Mr. Camille Doucet, the perpetual secretary of the Academy, stating the objections that had presented themselves against Mr. Frechette's admission to the competition and the manner in which they had been passed over. Mr. Frechette was a British subject and by the rules of the Academy no one was permitted to compete unless he was a French citizen; but these positive laws were set aside by the Academy and the foreign poet was admitted to the competition, the ground on which this was done being that, if Mr. Frechette was not a French citizen, he belonged nevertheless to a people of French origin and who, notwithstanding events, had remained French in heart and sentiment. Mr. Camille Doucet's supreme argument to justify the Academy in having admitted Mr. Frechette, in violation of its rules, to all the privileges reserved exclusively for Frenchmen, revived cruel memories, but showed that the Academy had well judged us. Mr. Doucet recalled a meeting held at Montreal in 1870, at the most disastrous stage of the war, to come to the relief of the French wounded and at which all present gave enthusiastic proof of their French origin

and their inviolable attachment to the fortunes of France.

Alas! gentlemen, the example was only too well chosen. Adversity is the crucible which tests all sentiments, and it was in the evil days of our old mother country that we felt how deeply we were attached to her and how warmly we loved her. Gentlemen, I take you to witness, if the wound left by that cruel war in the hearts of the children of Old France is in any respect more painful than the wound left by it in the hearts of the children of New France?

It was when the first news of the disasters of the French army reached us that we felt how French we were. Who does not remember the spectacle, in those mournful days, of the whole French population of Quebec massed around the newspaper offices and waiting with painful anxiety for the telegraph to give them the result of the battles of the previous day on the soil of their ancient mother country? Who does not remember the enormous crowds quivering with anguish and yet ready to thrill with emotion at the slightest ray of hope and only dispersing when the fatal truth was no longer in doubt? And when the final catastrophe occurred, when we had to yield to the inevitable, and when we had to resign ourselves to the conviction that Alsace and Lorraine were to be torn from France, I appeal to your recollections, gentlemen, if we were to be deprived of one of our own members, was it not the truth that we could not have suffered more cruelly? Since that time, we have waited with as deep a conviction and as firm a hope as those whom we persist in calling our brethren over the sea for the day of revenge. The age is no longer one in which populations may be violently torn from their native country and annexed against their will to a government which is not a government of their choice. The time has passed when might can permanently overbear right. Descendants of the French race as we are and long accustomed as we have been to the amplest liberty as English subjects, though

loudly and proudly under the shadow of the British flag proclaiming our French origin, we also have faith in this inevitable justice of human things, to which an illustrious statesman referred not long since. More than one of us, at the sight of France so calm and so patient, has been led to hope, nay, to believe that the day will come when that old device of our country, which goes back to the early days of the colony and is still to be seen inscribed on one of our public buildings, will be realized in Europe :

> Je suis un chien qui ronge l'os
> En le rongeant, je prends mon repos ;
> Un jour viendra qui n'est pas venu
> Quand je mordrai qui m'aura mordu.

As for us, gentlemen, we have our revenge already.

After the final cession of this country to the Crown of England, our forefathers loyally accepted the new order of things and made a vow to themselves that, if the occasion ever arose, they would spill their blood as freely for their new sovereign as they had done for their old ; but they promised themselves also that never should the French language, to the accents of which they had been rocked on their mothers' knees, disappear from the continent of America.

At present, after the lapse of a century, the French Academy honors us with the freedom of the city in the republic of French letters and proclaims in the face of the world that not only does the French language still live amongst us, but that it is worthy of the Academy.

There, gentlemen, is our revenge; we ask no other. It is complete and we owe it to the French Academy.

If it were possible for our voices to traverse space and cross the ocean, we would send from this very hall to the French Academy the tribute of our gratitude. The thing is impossible, but what is within our power is to acknowledge on the spot our indebted

ness to the valiant poet, who knocked at the doors of the Academy, was admitted,and came forth crowned; for, gentlemen, Mr Frechette's success is not only a personal, but a national success.

And a remarkable thing,as stated by our Chairman, which proves the high estimate in which we hold liberty, in this country, it is not only those who speak Mr. Frechette's tongue who rejoice in his triumph; our fellow countrymen of British origin rejoice as we do in his glory and claim their share of it.

Ought I to recall, however, that discordant voices were to be found among our own French fellow countrymen? I only mention the fact to remind onr guest that in, ancient triumphs,any one who felt inclined to do so was allowed to act as the traducer of the recipient of the triumph, but that it does not appear that the latter's laurels were ever sullied thereby. History has preserved the names of the latter, but it has disdained to speak of the traducer.

I mention this fact as a reminder to all that admiration of talent has never been and can never be incompatible with divergencies of opinion. This statement may not, perhaps, carry much weight, coming as it does from one who has fought under the same banner and belongs to the same school of political thought as he does; but, for the benefit of those self-styled Catholics, who, in the name of religion, when religion is in no sense in question,insult Mr Frechette's fame, I shall cite one example:

Under the Restoration, there was one day, in the prison of Paris, a prisoner confined for a political offence. He had been condemned for an offence characterized by the prosecution as an outrage against morals. His real offence was riddling with epigrams somewhat too keen the reigning dynasty, of which he was a declared enemy. One day a visitor, already advanced in years, but an ardent friend of the reigning dynasty, called to visit the prisoner. Gentlemen, the prisoner was Beranger; the visitor was

Chateaubriand. Some years later, a new revolution had placed the younger branch of the Bourbons on the throne of France, and there was also a prisoner detained for a political offence. He had been condemned for publishing a newspaper article on the occasion of a press law. His real offence was having manifested too openly his attachment to the fallen dynasty, the elder branch of the same house.

One day, a visitor called to visit the prisoner. This time, the prisoner was Chateaubriand; the visitor was Beranger. Gentlemen, as you know, between Chateaubriand and Beranger, there was nothing in common but talent. Both had in common what Napoleon, in speaking of Chateaubriand, had termed the sacred fire. In every other respect, they were dissimilar. Beranger was not a Christian. Chateaubriand was profoundly Christian. Chateaubriand had published a book, which, without contradiction, was one of the most eloquent and certainly the most courageous defences of Christianity since Tertullian. Mr. Frechette's adversaries will admit, perhaps, that it required more courage and more conviction to write the *Genie du Christianisme*, the day after the French Revolution, than it does to make on every occasion a parade of orthodoxy in our good province of Quebec, in the year of grace, 1880.

Yet, when Chateaubriand went to visit Beranger, he did not to pretend to thereby abdicate any of his religious convictions or to become responsible for Beranger's opinions. He was simply the man of genius paying homage to genius. It is a consolation for humanity to know that there are higher spheres in which lofty minds can meet on common ground, without being exposed to the lamentable bickerings and divisions of daily life.

Here, gentlemen, is the idea which inspired this meeting. Those, who are gathered to night around this festive board are here to pay homage to Mr. Frechette's talents as a poet and to prove that they esteem above all that incomparable French language,

in the use of which, according to the evidence of the Academy, Mr Frechette is the equal of the best in France.

Gentlemen, I have again the honor to propose the health of the French Academy.

The Construction of the Pacific.

CRITICISM OF THE CONTRACT ENTERED INTO WITH THE SYNDICATE.

(Speech made in English by Hon W. Laurier, in the House of Commons, at its sitting of the 21st December, 1880).

MR. SPEAKER,

The contract now before us, and which the House is asked to sanction, is the last and crowning consequence of the principle laid down ten years ago by the Government then in power, when they introduced the Canadian Pacific Railway scheme,and which was: that this railway should be built immediately and without interruption until its completion, It must be clear, from the remarks of the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), with regard to the position of the two great parties, that, at the outset, the ground taken by the Conservative party was this: the railroad should be built immediately, and without interruption till finally completed; whereas the policy of the Liberals was that it should be built gradually as the wants of the country should require and its resources permit. The reason urged by the leader of the Conservative party for the immediate completion of the road was, that it was a necessity of Confederation which would otherwise remain incomplete. If it was, it was not a necessity of Confederation as primarily established; nor was it a necessity that sprang from any natural cause. If it was, however, such a neces-

sity, it is perhaps the severest commentary upon the policy followed some years ago of creating whole provinces out of the wilderness, and of endowing them with all the institutions and luxuries with which provinces with large populations must be supplied, while in these cases there was

SCARCELY ANY POPULATION.

Honorable gentlemen opposite will remember that they received ample warning not to create that state of things which would bind this country to the immediate completion of the road. They were reminded that if they did so they would be putting a burden on this country too heavy for its strength to bear; but they did not heed these warnings, they forced their followers to vote for this policy, and now, as a crowning consequence of that policy, their followers are asked to consent to the enormous sacrifices involved in this contract. If I recall these facts, it is without any intention to recriminate. This is not the time of recrimination, it is the time of all others when every man should apply himself to discharging his duties to the best of his lights and conscience.

Sir John A. Macdonald :—Hear, hear !

Mr. Laurier :—If I recall these facts it is simply to say once more, if such evidence is necessary, that the great principles of a country are never to be trifled with ; that the true principles which should guide the policy of a nation should never be deviated from, because,

IF ONCE DEVIATED FROM,

the country will be led from consequence to consequence ending in a most fatal conclusion. In my humble judgment, it was in 1871 a fault—I will not say it was a crime, though I might say without severity it was a political crime—at all events it was a fault to blind this country to the immediate construction of the road. It was a fault, last session, after the

experience of the previous ten years to persist in that policy. It was a fault not then to have adopted the policy suggested by the honorable member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) of commencing in the east, and building this road gradually as the resources of the country would permit. That the undertaking to build this railway until final completion within a short term was a vicious policy, to say the least, is fully proved by the conduct of the Government since they have entered office. It is proved by their hesitation and vacillation in carrying out their scheme when the necessity of carrying it out was forced on them, and it is further shown by the present contract. What has been the policy of the present Government? In less than three years they have

CHANGED THEIR POLICY THREE TIMES.

The first year after they had resumed power, they came before Parliament with a great scheme—a new idea—and the idea was that this road should be henceforth considered as an Imperial work that the Imperial authorities should be asked to contribute to it, because the surplus population of the Empire would find homes in the North-West. This idea was accepted by the followers of the honorable gentleman as a masterpiece of policy. It was represented as such by the party orators and the press; yet, good as the idea was, it did not last. It withered as the flowers of summer, but was immediately replaced by another scheme which was submitted last session. The principle of this scheme was that the lands should pay for the building of the road. This scheme was accepted by the followers of the honorable gentleman with the same enthusiasm as was the first, yet it also met an early fate. It did not last, and no wonder. When the Government brought down this plan, a feeling found vent in the resolution moved by the present leader of the Opposition. The resolution, it is true, was voted down, but I think we can survive it. Many

honorable gentlemen opposite, when voting down that resolution, strove hard to conceal under a smiling face a heavy heart. I think we can survive that, because the Government, immediately after the session was over, abandoned the very policy which they had called on their followers to support. Yet something had to be done. The Government were

IN A DILEMMA,

for if they went on to carry out the work, they might cripple the finances of the country to a degree almost beyond remedy. If they did not go on with the work, they would be going back on their old policy. What was to be done? Like the wizard in the tale who found his own life in constant danger from the fangs and claws of the strange progeny which he had reared, they, too, had created a monster that threatened their own destruction. What was to be done? They went to Europe. They offered their white elephant for sale in the markets of Paris and London, but no one would accept it even as a gift. Finally, they had to take the beast home, where they gave it a vast territory to roam over, made it impossible for any other being to go into the pasture, and then they found somebody who was willing to relieve them of this ever recurring cause of anxiety. That this proposed arrangement is a vicious policy is well proved by the language which the Government used to induce their supporters into voting in favor of this contract. What was the answer they gave to the numerous objections raised against it? It was simply this; do not criticize but accept the contract; it is the best we could get. In order to show this clearly I cannot do better than quote on this subject the very words which were used the other day by the honorable Minister of Public Works:

Well, Mr. Chairman, in this case we have not to deal with only one party, we have to deal with the syndicate. Those

gentlemen are the one party and we are the other. We have to make a contract with them for the building of this road, shall we say to them, you must take that or nothing? That is not the way contracts are made. You have to give and take. You have to take into consideration the exigencies of the case. You have to see whether your terms are acceptable to the other party, and after reasoning the matter with the other party you will find that he is right, and your proposal is not sufficient, and if you have to give more lands or money, other conditions, the result is that you have to agree to give aud take on both sides to prepare the contract and sign it. That is what we have done. Here is a contract, and we say it is the best we can do.

Is this the language of a free Government, of the executive power of a free nation? What has seized the Government of this country that they have been compelled to accept this contract from the Syndicate? Who in the world compelled the Government to negotiate with the Syndicate? What great calamity has befallen this country that the Government should be compelled

TO SURRENDER UNCONDITIONALLY

to the Syndicate? If there had been a war and we had been defeated, and the Government forced to accept from the victor such terms as suited him to enforce, and if the Government came here to have the treaty ratified, would their language have been different to that used in order to induce their supporters to accept the contract? When, in the year 1871, at the termination of the disastrous war with Prussia, the Provisional Government of France met the newly elected National Assembly and presented to it the treaty concluded with Germany, by which France ceded to that country two of its best provinces, some of the members protested against the clauses of that treaty. And what was the language of the French Government in reply? It was exactly the same as used to-day by our Administration; accept the terms, they are the

best we could get. France had been defated in war and lay crushed under the iron heel of the victor: our Government had not been defeated, but were bound in the shackles of their own vicious policy. After having spoken the language which I have just quoted the honorable Minister of Public Works went on to say: " I believe it is to the advantage of the country that we should save the money of the country by adopting these resolutions, and I hope the answer will be " Yes " from all our friends ". This is the crowning consequence, and the followers of the Government are this time asked to give the final " Yes " which will plunge this country

INTO AN UNKNOWN EXPENDITURE.

Yet I am free to confess, since the Government are determined to go on with the construction of this railway at once until completion, the idea that it should be built by a company is one which has a great deal in it to commend itself to the people of this country. But for the very reason given by the honorable Minister in the early part of his speech, there were difficulties in the way. He said:

> But although the country stood by us, and a large majority of the members of this House sanctioned the action of the Government, nevertheless, it would be childish to conceal that there was a possibility of apprehension for the future. The feeling was this, that the uncertainty about the amount of money that would be required to build the railway was disturbing the public mind. Nobody could say positively what would be the liabilities of the country, or how many millions would be required, not merely to build the road but to work it, and to work it for all time to come.

The honorable Minister might have added that the public mind was also disturbed by the necessity of the Government having still to go on letting out contracts, and seeing that contracts already made were carried out. Such were, Mr. Chairman, the rea-

sons why the country favoured the policy of handing this work over to a company. But have these expectations been fulfilled by this contract? This contract is a policy which does not meet any of the reasons advanced in its favor by the honorable Minister. The country expected that by this contract the Government would be relieved of the necessity of letting out new contracts and seeing that old ones are carried out. For ten years to come they have

TO PURSUE THE SAME SYSTEM

which they pursued in the past, and which caused anxiety in the public mind. The people of this country expected that their liabilities for constructing this road would be settled. But this, I believe, also is denied. They cannot be settled for this very reason that the Government must pursue the same course which it pursued before. For ten years to come it must go on letting out contracts, and the liability will be settled only when ten years hence the work has been completed. So that this is a hybrid engagement which fulfils none of the engagements it was expected to fulfil. It would in fact so appear, as it were, a sort of partnership between the Government and the company. There are four sections of the road to build, the company builds two sections, and the Government two sections, and those the most difficult. The company completes in ten years, and the Government completes in ten years, and at the end of the ten years the whole is to be handed over to the company. Not only that, but while the Government is doing the work of the company, the company is to have all the privileges of the Government. The company can import as free as the Government can. The company is exempted from taxation as the Government is. The company has the further privilege of fixing its own tolls almost without the possibility of hindrance or interference on the part of the Government. I say almost the possibility of interference,

for I confess that under the letter of the contract there is a possibility of interference. But when is the Government to interfere? Only when the company has realized ten per cent on the cost of constructing the road, which cost is estimated on the other side at $78,000,000. As to the privilege given to the company of importing their materials free, that has perhaps more the nature of a family quarrel among honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House, and, therefore, I shall have nothing to say upon it. As to the exemption from taxation, that is

A FAR MORE SERIOUS MATTER,

and one which should engage the attention of this House. It has been contended on this side of the House that this exemption from taxation, coupled with the other advantages and privileges given to the company, will give almost a monopoly of the North-West Territories into the hands of this company. This assertion has been replied to by gentlemen on the other side. But under this contract the road-bed, the station grounds, rolling stock, capital of the company, are to be for all time, for all generations to come, exempted from all sorts of taxation; from federal taxation, if ever such a contingency should happen, from local taxation when local governments are organized, from municipal taxation when municipalities are established. If we consider that this company is thereby given an unfair advantage over every other company who try to compete with them, it will be seen that it will be difficult to secure competition with them. Thus the company have, therefore, the privilege to hold these lands and, like the dog in the manger, to prevent any one using them except themselves; and they have also the privilege of fixing their own tolls so as to obtain extortionate profits out of the settlers of the North-West. It must be evident, Mr. Chairman, to every dispassionate observer, that this is a monstrous monopoly, and one that will

make the company landlords of the North-West. I use that term advisedly. It is true that it is not in the power of this company to establish such institutions as would amount to feudalism, in the sense in which it exists in Europe, and which it needs almost a convulsion to get rid of; but feudalism is not the only mode by which populations can be enslaved by a combination; it is not the only mode by which the many can he made

THE TOY OF THE FEW.

Nor can it be contended that, on this continent where we claim to be free, where we claim to have got rid of feudalism, no large combinations can be attempted whereby men can get dishonest terms out of the toil of others. We have the fact already before us; we were told the other day by the honorable leader of the Opposition, that, at this very day, the railway magnates of the North-West extort such enormous profits from the settlers of the country for carrying their goods to market that it practically amounts to their having proprietary interests in their farms, and the settlers are thereby deprived of the best part of their profits. This may not be feudalism in name, but is it not feudalism in substance and in fact? Then, Sir, here is another feature of the vicious policy which has been followed hitherto. Without venturing any expression of positive opinion, it may be a question, whether, if the road, instead of being built, as it is now contended it must be built, had been gradually and step by step constructed, as the necessities of the country might require, it might not have been a consideration whether it should be built by a subsidy of lands and money, or whether the Government of Canada should proclaim to the world that the needy and poor of the whole world could find free lands and free soil throughout the whole of the North-West, and that they should be enabled to obtain the best market prices for their products.

Perhaps, if that system had been followed, there might, in a few years, have been

A FEW LESS MILLIONAIRES

in this country, but there would have been a much greater number of happy and contented homes. But another system has been followed. Twenty-five million acres of land are to be given to this company, and are to be locked up at the option of the company. The result of that policy must be the same in the North-West as it has been in every place where we have had land companies. The immigrants will first settle upon the lands of the Government, upon the homestead and the preemption lands; but, after a certain while, when they commence to be crowded, both from outside and within, they will squat upon the lands of the company, and then one of two results must follow—either they will be ejected by the agents of the company, or they will be compelled to submit to the extortionate terms that will be forced upon them by the company. We know well that the majority of the settlers will be poor, that the majority of them will have no other means, no other capital, than their able bodies, and we know well, by experience in the past, what exertions it requires for such settlers to pay up the instalments on their farms, when they have to supply the requirements of their families and to furnish their farms. Moreover, by-and-bye, municipal governments will have to be organized in that territory, roads will have to be laid out and opened, and yet this company cannot be taxed for these roads, which will be a constant source of litigation and bitterness in the country. Against all this, what have we? What is the safeguard, what is the guarantee, that we have against the possible, I should rather say, the certain evils of the proposed system? We have, as a guarantee, only the good will of the company itself. It has been asserted, on the other side, that the present members of the company are men of

the highest character, and certainly every one may assent to this ; but if the men who now constitute the company are men of the highest character, who knows who will be the members of the company ten years hence, five years hence, or even six months hence ? Who can say that, six months from to-day, this company will not have not gone to New-York, and, for a money consideration, bartered its interests

TO FOREIGN CAPITALISTS,

given them the privilege of locating the line themselves, and of still further oppressing the settlers on the company's lands, in order to recoup themselves for the consideration they have given to the company ? But, Mr. Chairman, whoever may be the members of this company, we know that they are of the human race, and it is a well known fact, and one illustrated by the whole history of mankind, that men in every station of life, where they are not checked by positive laws and regulations, will abuse their position to the detriment of others, if they can gain any advantage by it. And we have an example of the way in which this company will treat the settlers by the manner in which they have treated the Government. They have driven a hard bargain with the Government. They have obtained the most onerous terms from the Government ; and if they have extorted these onerous terms from the Government, what is it for ? Is it for the pleasure of gaining a moral victory over the Government, and making no use of it, or is it not to make the best use they can out of these onerous terms, to make the land they obtained worth to them all they can make out of it ? On the whole therefore, the position of the settler in the North West, will be, under this contract, the position of a Tantalus, before a well dressed table, at which he cannot satisfy his appetite. The settlers cannot settle on the lands which are close to them, without submitting to the terms of the company.

Mr. Plumb—They will settle on the Government lands alongside.

Mr. Laurier. — But I presume the honorable gentleman does not suppose the population of this country should be confined only to the Government lands. Look at this matter in any way, and it is this: that you create

A MOST MONSTROUS MONOPOLY.

We, from the province of Quebec, know what a monopoly is, and I call the attention of my colleagues from that province to our experience under that monopoly. I know in that province we had a bitter experience of the seigniorial rights, and we had to try hard before we could get them abolished. There was a monopoly of the right to establish mills held by the seigneurs, and we wanted the right extended to the people at large. I am free to say that if that privilege had been refused us by the legislature, it might have caused a rebellion. I think every province of the Dominion has had its land company. There has been one in Ontario, one in New Brunswick, one in Quebec, and one in Prince Edward Island; and I am quite certain I can appeal to the experience of every honorable member of this House from this province to say that the results of these monopolies have been everywhere and at all times the same, namely, to retard settlement and press heavily upon the energies of the settlers; that they have everywhere been a curse and a bane. This has been the case with regard to land companies which have not one-tenth of the powers which have been granted to the Syndicate by the present contract. It is said: and I have been reminded by the honorable member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), that there are blocks of land reserved between those which have been granted to the company. We have reports to the effect that we have 250,000,000 acres more land in that country, though we have not such accurate information as yet as will enable us to be absolutely

certain upon that matter. However, I am quite ready to believe that we have 200,000,000 acres space in that country; but when we deduct from that the land covered with lakes, streams and marshes, the mountains and hills, the barren lands, and those which are unfit for settlement on account of climatic conditions, lands which are only fit far grazing purposes, and we further deduct the portion which belongs to the Hudson's Bay company and those reserved for school purposes,

WHAT WILL REMAIN FOR OUR SETTLERS

over and above the 25,000,000 acres allotted to this company? Looked at from whatever point of view you choose, there is not a single redeeming feature in the gigantic monopoly which has been given to this company. There is another objectionable feature in this contract—not perhaps objectionable *per se*, but rendered so by the nature and condition of the country at the present time. This contract forces us to go on immediately with the construction of the road along the north shore of Lake Superior. We are all agreed that a Canadian Pacific Railway must be built on Canadian soil. We all agree on this point.

Mr. Langevin:—Hear, hear!

Mr. Laurier:—I do not think there are two opinions in regard to that matter.

Mr. Langevin:—Your leader differs from you.

Mr. Laurier:—No; he says that we should go on with the building of the road as the requirements of the country may demand. I have never heard expressed here the opinion that the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be built. The only point upon which there is any disagreement is as to the expediency of building the whole road at once, or only as rapidly as the wants of the country may require. I think it must be perfectly manifest that this section on the north shore of Lake Superior is not required at the present time, that its construction might be

ADVANTAGEOUSLY POSTPONED

until some future period, and that it would be quite sufficient, at present, to build the eastern section as far as Sault Ste Marie. The fertile plains of the west are separated from the east by an extent of barren territory in the region north of the Lake, while it happens that the route along the southern shore would pass through some of the best lands on the continent—through several of the most important States of the Union. Would it not be better, under those circumstances, to bring the road immediately to Sault Ste Marie, tap the American system of railways, and secure not merely the trade of our own North-West, but a large share of the traffic from those States. This is so evident from a geographical point of view, that I will not stay to discuss it. There are two policies before the House at the present moment. The policy of the Government is : that the road shall be constructed at once on the north shore of Lake Superior. What would be the consequence of carrying out that policy ? There would be no communication by that road with the Eastern railways for ten years to come ; and though we may secure the incipient trade of our own territories we would lose the traffic from the North-Western States of the Union. The other policy would be to bring the line at once to Sault Ste Marie, thus securing us immediate connection, not only with the North-West, but with the American railways. Can any one hesitate for a moment in the presence of that policy ? What reason can be urged for the adoption of the route along the north shore of Lake Superior ? Though the question has thus far been discussed entirely in an unsectional spirit, I think I might well enquire which of these two policies will be of most benefit to my own province ? The immediate connection of the road to Sault Ste Marie would at once carry over the railway system of Quebec the trade of our own North-West and of the American North-Western States as well—a state of things which

would prove of immense and obvious benefit to the cities of Montreal and Quebec. But this is not the primary reason for the adoption of the line by way of Sault Ste Marie. This road

WOULD HELP OUR PROVINCE

to get out of the financial difficulties by which it is at present beset. That province has now a debt which exceeds $15,000,000; this year it has been compelled to borrow $4,000,000 more, and this with the pressure of constant and annually increasing deficits. It is a matter of anxiety to every inhabitant of Quebec how these deficits are to be met, but so far it has been found impossible to devise a means by which they can be wiped out. Our resources have been pledged, to the fullest extent, and they have not that elasticity which will enable us to avail ourselves of them in the near future. Our only resource will be the direct taxation of our people unless we are so happy as to find a means of increasing the traffic of our railways. Unless that relief comes within a short period, the financial prospects of Quebec must be held to be critical, indeed. If the road to Sault Ste Marie was constructed, instead of having to wait for ten years, we should have, within a period of two or three years, at the utmost, the benefit of the trade of North-Western Canada and the United States; and it must be evident to every honorable gentleman from Quebec that that traffic would be of material assistance to our province in its present financial condition. I do not say that that assistance would be sufficient to lead us out of present difficulties, but it would leave the present and future of our Province not so dark as it is at the present moment. I would appeal upon this question to my fellow-countrymen from Quebec who are supporting the Government. We have often been told, by the supporters of the Government in Lower Canada, especially by the press, of the immense influence which these honorable members have with the Admin-

istration, that they have only to come and ask what they want and they will receive it at once. They would almost have us believe that the Government occupy the position of the servant mentioned in Scripture, who came when he was told to come and went where he was told to go. If these gentlemen have so much influence with the Government, now or never is their opportunity of exercising it to the great benefit of their province, and for the purpose of averting injury to the Dominion, for I hold that the adoption of this contract would be a great calamity to the Dominion at large.

IT IS A DELUSION,

because it would not remove any of those inconvemences expected to be dispersed; because it leaves the Government with the same inconveniences that were experienced in the past with the former system, and adds to them other and greater. It is a danger, because it threatens to create, upon the free soil of this country, a monopoly which may at some time or another be a cause of trouble to the peace and harmony of this country. This is the contract of which Ministers are so proud, that the mere remembrance of connection with its inception and execution they feel proud to leave as a legacy to their children. My wish and hope is that the legacy may be as pleasant to their offspring as to the parents. I am quite sure it will, because we know it is a law of human nature that where the affections are strong and love prevails even faults are accounted merits. I think it was the Minister of Public Works who stated that this contract was calculated to enrich our country, increase our population, and secure our free institutions. How it is to achieve all these results is not to my humble perception quite visible. As to its securing British institutions in this country, I would be sorry indeed for my country if they were dependent upon the con-

struction of a railway, whether of gigantic or diminutive proportions. British institutions rest in this country upon a surer foundation; they are impressed upon the minds and hearts of our people, because this land, inhabited as it is by men differing in creed and origin, and whose fathers were once separated by dire national feuds, have secured under those institutions freedom, equality, amity and good will. But Ministers should remember the fact, which they seem to forget, that those institutions that have secured us our present blessings.

ARE THOSE OF THE 19TH CENTURY,

and not those of an earlier time, the relics of barbarian days. If honorable gentlemen opposite are desirous of securing British institutions, they must introduce into the legislation of this country the broad spirit of modern England, and not seek to establish those monopolies which at this day prove so many thorns in the side of England, great as she is. Let them look at the country they pretend to admire, and they will see what deep and firm roots abuses will strike into the soil, and what toils, labors, miseries and sufferings, such abuses can produce to the people of that country. They have examples of this kind before their eyes at this very day If this contract is to be judged in the light of modern British ideas and principles, it carries with it its death-warrant, and the only duty that remains for this House to perform is simply to reject it on the first opportunity.

The Hon. Edward Blake at Montreal

THE MEMORABLE BANQUET OF 1881

MR. LAURIER PAYS HOMAGE TO HIS LEADER

On the 29th March, 1881, Honorable Edward Blake received a great ovation at Montreal. The *Young Men's Reform Club*, all the English and French youth of the Canadian metropolis, joined in giving a grand banquet in his honor at the Windsor Hotel. The festivity was attended with extraordinary eclat, the number of guests present being larger at least by a hundred than at any of the finest public banquets previously given in Montreal. Mr. Blake, escorted by Mr. Maclaren, president of the *Y.M.R. Club*, took his seat at the table d'honneur, having alongside of him Honorable Messrs. Laurier, Mercier, Huntingdon, Langelier, Laflamme, Thibaudeau, Joly, Marchand and a crowd of members, public men and leading citizens: Messrs. Holton, J. Scriver, R. Prefontaine, J McShane, F. G. Bouthillier, H. A. Nelson, W. Prevost, Jacques Grenier, Proctor, Hagar, Brown, H. Lyman, J. Hodgson, P. H. Roy, James Stewart, F. X. Archambault, A. E. Poirier, A. Favreau, Jos. Duhamel, &c. The masterly speech delivered by Mr. Blake on the occasion was reproduced by the whole Liberal press of the time; we now reconstruct from notes taken at the banquet Mr Laurier's reply to the toast of "the House of Commons."

MR. CHAIRMAN,
AND GENTLEMEN,

There have been few occasions in my life on which I have felt so much genuine satisfaction as in sitting down at this table to-night.

You have called upon me to reply to the toast of the House of Commons and I comply with the greatest pleasure, for it enables me to give expression to the sentiments with which my heart is overflowing.

The immense satisfaction I feel does not come from the fact that the city of Montreal, the city which our adversaries have been pleased to ever regard as their stronghold, has been the first to hail the new leader of the Liberal party; nor does it arise even from the very legitimate emotion of the personal and political friend at the spectacle of this enthusiastic public expression of sympathy for the great ability and the not less eminent character of Mr. Blake.

No, this intense satisfaction rather springs from the fact that this demonstration is the inspiration and work of our young men, that the youth of this country are the first to hail the new leader of the Liberal party, and that that youth, true to the generous instincts of their years, thus proclaim their adhesion to the ideas of the Liberal party on the very morrow of a session during which, in Parliament, those ideas were crushed by the weight of a compact majority.

You have proposed the health of the House of Commons. We are the party of reform and I drink to the reformation of the present House of Commons, in the hope that, when it passes though the crucible of another election, the signal note sounded here tonight by the young men of Montreal will find an echo and that, in the new House of Commons, Mr. Blake's policy will be triumphant.

This, however, is only a hope. Those present here this evening do not hesitate to believe that that policy is the policy of the future. But should it be victorious at the next elections or should it even not be victorious in our day is another question—a question which is only of secondary importance for us. We do not concern ourselves to know whether we shall gather the fruits of the seed we are now sowing or whether they shall be gathered by our successors? For the moment, we only see one thing, that the

cause which is dear to us all, the cause which we believe just and true, is, despite the transcendent ability and character of our chief, in a disastrous minority among the representatives of the people. Once more, this is not what concerns us. Be that cause strong or weak numerically, it is the cause of right and justice. The young men who hail Mr. Blake on the morrow of the session, do not look to what was the success of his efforts. Moreover, it is the the nature of generous souls, of youth especially, to not prize success, but rather the cause and we can proudly exclaim with the ancient poet:

Victrix causa diis placuit, sed victa Catoni.

Young men of the Montreal Liberal clubs, young English Canadians, young French Canadians, you all, the organizers of this demonstration, it would be, perhaps, misplaced on my part to offer you thanks. Still I cannot resist the pleasure of doing so. In this age of universal egotism, when even the young do not always escape the contagion, it is consoling to see that you at least have remained faithful to the enthusiasm and the disinterestedness which from time immemorial have been the glorious appanage of youth.

I am happy to note this fact, for, to my mind, the first duty of the Liberal party is to regenerate the public sentiment of the country.

Nothing could be more deplorable or more disastrous than the state of degradation into which politics have fallen.

As I speak, there is in this province a great party in which each act done or word spoken is only done or spoken in view of the personal benefit of the doer or speaker. If they go beyond these walls, the views which I am now expressing will, perhaps, be furiously assailed and their truth angrily disputed; and my statements, perhaps, will be treated as a slander. I nevertheless reiterate what I have asserted and for their truth, I appeal not to you, gentlemen, but to

our adversaries themselves; I make this appeal, not to what is uttered publicly, not to what is printed for the galleries, but what is fearlessly and frankly admitted in the secrecy of friendship, and there, gentlemen, you know, for we have all heard it repeated ten, twenty, a hundred times, those who still regard political honor as something, those who still believe that patriotism is not a word without meaning, those whose hearts are touched and strongest emotions aroused by the word country, are treated as simpletons, the true policy, in the opinion of the strong, positive minds, who look down upon them for their guilelessness, being to always speak and act in view of the profit derivable from each word or act.

Gentlemen, I have no need to tell you that if in politics we only keep in view our individual interests, if each act, each word, has to be measured according to the benefits derivable therefrom, then we are not worthy to be a free people. Alas! if those who laid down their lives on the battle-field or this scaffold had shared the views of the contemporary school, had calculated their acts and their words according to the new rule, instead of dying as they died, they would have lived on the favors and largesses which the bureaucracy of their day would have been only too glad to shower upon them, and our people would still be a people of slaves.

Alas! the times are greatly changed, but is it necessary to repeat that there is no salvation for a country unless its citizens remain faithful to it and place the public over private interest?

The party, which has governed us almost without interruption for twenty-five years, has forgotten these great truths. It has ruled by pandering to cupidity and by putting personal over general interests. Its appeals unhappily have found only too wide an echo. The policy of this province has been shaped not in view of the public interest, which should alone be the pole star of the true patriot, but in view of individual interests. And now, look at the result? We are on

the brink of an abyss, the depth of which is unfathomable, and it is evident that, in a few years, the country will find itself face to face with a frightful financial situation.

What will be the upshot of this fatal state of things? We see the evil well enough, but where are we to look for the remedy? With a debt of many millions, a limited asset, an exhausted credit and not even the honor, which is the last resource of those who have none, what remains to us with which to confront the situation? I trust I may be mistaken in predicting that the province will probably have to pay with the loss of some of its constitutional liberties for the crime, with which I charge the party in power, of not having governed for the country, of not having alone consulted the public interest, and of having sacrificed the public cause to personal cupidity.

For our part, we, who claim to continue the work of the men who conquered the constitutional liberties which we to-day enjoy, we, who claim to be following the path traced out by those grand figures who still shine out in our history, by those who loved their country to the extent of dying for it; we only seek, like them, in the share we take in public affairs, the greatest possible sum of good for the country.

What we have to contend against at present is this dissolving tendency to only consider personal interest, which leads to venality, to the debasement of consciences, to all those infamies of the recent past and to all the dangers which are looming up in the near future.

Once more, I say that, if the public cause is not worth the greatest efforts of which we are capable, we are not worthy of being a free people.

The Liberal party has nothing to hold out to those who march in its ranks. We are in the minority, and we have no favors, honors, lucrative places or high-sounding titles to distribute. We cherish a legitimate ambition to triumph and to see Mr. Blake at the head of this country, but, if we hope for its

gratification, it is not for the individual profit which each of us may derive from the circumstance, but for the good of the country at large.

I do not pretend to be indifferent to the possession of power. Under our system of government, the possession of power and its accompanying advantages are the legitimate reward of the victorious; but the first and the principal object is to struggle for what we believe to be just and true, whatever may be the upshot of our efforts.

The heroism of those who died on the battlefield simply for the honor of their country is remembered with emotion. The last charge made at Reischoffen by McMahon's cuirassiers, riding to their certain and, so to say, useless death, is recalled with emotion, because it was a last sacrifice to the fortunes of France. Well, if the soldier gives up his life for his country, is it too much to expect the citizen to sacrifice a few material advantages for the sake of fidelity to what he believes to be his country's cause ?

As for us, once more I repeat that our leaders have nothing to offer individually and we look for nothing from them. Our adversaries may not know it, but we know what the noble pride of being honorable in our own eyes is worth, and we also know the worth of the proud pleasure of owing nothing except to ourselves, of expecting nothing except from ourselves, and of being patriots in deed as well as in name.

The Ontario Boundary Question

THE DECISION OF THE ARBITRATORS IN 1882

FAVORABLE TO ONTARIO, BUT REJECTED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH IN FAVOR OF THE AWARD OF THE ARBITRATORS

The following speech deals with a subject of interest not only to the people of Ontario, but also to those of the province of Quebec, whose northern boundary is not yet determined. Before the annexation of the North-West, it was perfectly understood that the territory of Ontario extended to beyond Port Arthur and the Lake of the Woods. But since the annexation, the Federal Government disputed the legality of this boundary, which would have taken away Algoma and a vast region from Ontario and very nearly provoked troubles and acts of violence in the disputed territory. The Mackenzie Cabinet proposed an arbitration, which was accepted; but, when the arbitrators made their award, Sir John A Macdonald, who had in the meantime returned to power, refused to submit to it. Recourse had to be had to the courts; and Honorable Mr. Mowatt, Premier of Ontario, carried the affair to England, where he gained his cause. All these difficulties and judicial expenses would have been avoided, if in 1882 the advice given

by Mr. Laurier in these terms, at the sitting of the House of Commons on the 4th April, 1882, had been followed :

MR. SPEAKER,

The resolution is now in your hands, and all the honorable gentlemen who have addressed you from the opposite side of the House, strongly insist upon the propriety of treating this question from a purely legal point of view. Acting themselves upon this principle, they have attacked, at great length, the award rendered by the arbitrators to whom the decision of this question was confided by the Governments of Ontario and of the Dominion. They have dissected this award minutely and have come to the conclusion that, had they sat on the commission, they would have reached a different decision from the one rendered by the arbitrators. They have piled up arguments, disquisitions and opinions, to establish that the arbitrators greatly erred when they decided that the word "northward" in the act really means towards the north, whereas, in their opinion, it means simply north and nothing more. Well, everybody knows that in the past there has been no more prolific cause of discussion than

THE SIGNIFICATION OF WORDS.

In listening to-day to the learned and elaborate disquisitions of the honorable gentlemen opposite upon the meaning of the words "downwards" "northwards", and "due north," I was strongly reminded of a letter which is to be found in the appendix of the work of the hon. member for Bothwell, which was addressed by the Marquis de Torcy to Lord Bolingbroke, on the 25th December, 1712, at the time when the negotiations for the treaty of Utrecht were going on. The letter of the Marquis de Torcy complained that too much weight was put by the British plenipotentiary on mere words. He wrote:

"In the name of God, Sir, order your plenipotentiaries to be less excellent grammarians. Ours, who also understand the force of Latin expressions, are out of patience, when they see difficulties which have been long adjusted started again, and the difference between *cession* and *restitution*, and the meaning of those terms. In truth, Sir, such questions ought not to be the amusement of honorable men. They are, at best, excusable in those to whom we may apply the epithet *amantium irae*. Finish those disputes which, if they continue longer, will only profit our enemies."

Well, there is nothing new under the sun, and one would really think that this letter was written expressly for the purpose of the present discussion, and if we substitute the words "north" and "due north" for the words "cession" and "restitution" it would exactly apply to the present case. In truth, such questions ought not to be the amusement of honorable men unless they are excusable as being *amantium irae*. On this side of the House I may say that we have no patience when we see difficulties which have been long since adjusted revived again by the honorable gentlemen opposite

ON THE FRIVOLOUS PRETEXT

that the meaning of the words "north" and "due north" were not properly understood by the arbitrators. This question has been settled. Why should it be opened up again? But what would be the benefit of opening the question? If, however, it is to be opened, we are just as anxious as are honorable gentlemen opposite that the question should be treated exclusively as a legal one and should be approached in no other spirit except a judicial one. But let me ask those honorable gentlemen, who have urged on the House the propriety of treating it as a purely legal one, whether in such an event they have the right to criticize the award rendered. If they are sincere in their opinion, and I believe they are, that

the question shall be treated simply as a legal one, be approached only in a judicial spirit, can they ignore the great fundamental principle in matters of arbitration that an award is binding on both parties and cannot be questioned, except for cause? And what is the cause in this case—what causes can be adduced for refusing to submit to the award? The answer is, that the arbitrators have erred. The only cause adequate to contest the award is this: it lies with the party challenging the award to show there has been fraud on the part of the arbitrators or that it is grossly unjust. This is a fundamental principle which no one will gainsay. Yet no fraud is charged against the arbitrators—they are above suspicion. No substantial injustice is charged. What is charged against them is this: that they may possibly have erred and taken a wrong view of the case before them. This cannot be brought as a charge against the award and unless honorable gentlemen opposite are prepared to say there has been fraud on the part of the arbitrators, or that shocking injustice has occurred,

THEY HAVE NO RIGHT

to review and criticize the award as they have done. Although no charge of injustice is brought against the award, or fraud against the arbitrators, yet some objections are made by honorable gentlemen opposite. What are those objections? The first is that the reference of the question to arbitrators, which was made by the late Government, was made without the sanction of Parliament; and this they hold to be a fatal objection. In law and in fact this contention is unfounded. The honorable member for Bothwell has shown conclusively that it was within the power of the Crown to make such a reference. It may be said that such a prerogative of the Crown would hardly obtain under our constitution; the most punctilious will reply that the reference was made with the authority of Parliament. It was, however, not made

with the authority of Parliament couched in an Act; but the authority given by Parliament was just as if it had been given by an Act. It is within the recollection of many honorable members that during the late Parliament the question was often referred to on the floor of Parliament. Not only so, but in the session of 1878, $15,000 were voted by Parliament for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the commission which had been charged with the settlement of the Ontario boundaries. I ask any fair-minded man if Parliament could have sanctioned anything on more binding terms than it did when it voted the necessary money to carry out the expenses of the commission. Could the authority have been more binding if Parliament had passed an Act to refer the case to arbitration? If these honorable gentlemen will look upon the question as a purely legal one—if they will look upon it in a judicial spirit, such as they invite us to do, they cannot come to another conclusion than that Parliament could sanction the action of the Government, and therefore the argument which we have heard so often repeated in this debate falls to the ground. It remains indisputable that

PARLIAMENT GAVE ITS AUTHORITY

in the most open and binding manner that it was possible for Parliament to do.

Another objection made against the award is this: it is said this is a legal question and being a legal question it ought to have been settled by lawyers and courts. Now, sir, I cannot concede that the authority of the gentlemen who rendered the award is to be questioned because they did not all happen to belong to the legal profession. No one will presume to assert that justice, fairness and knowledge are the exclusive endowments of lawyers. We saw a few days ago, in a committee of this House, doctors of divinity arguing questions of law as ably and as skilfully as any lawyer could have done, and I am satisfied that every one must

admit that the arbitrators were endowed with all the qualities necessary to render such an award as would satisfy the most punctilious. First we have Mr. Justice Harrison, whose lofty character and clear and cool legal acumen shone so conspicuously in his career; then we have Sir Francis Hincks, whose fertile and versatile talents eminently fitted him for such a position; and then we have the British Ambassador, who, by his profession, his occupation, by his knowledge and character, was just as well fitted to deal with such a question as any professional man could have been. For my own part, I protest against the assertion that questions of law should always be settled by the law courts. I say that the interests of society do not require that questions of law should always be so decided. The most trivial disputes that arise between men involve questions of law, but the interests of society demand that these disputes should be settled, if possible, by the contending parties, or, failing in this, by arbitrators appointed by mutual agreement, but that

ONLY AS A LAST RESORT

should they have recourse to courts of law.

Another objection is made against the award. It is said that the arbitrators have not solved the questions, but that they have made a compromise between the questions submitted by the respective parties. Mr. Speaker, it is very strange that such an assertion should be made, and so often made on the floor of the House, when every man should now know better than to make such an assertion. Sir Francis Hincks declared in his lecture, delivered at Toronto, that no compromise was made; that the arbitrators had applied themselves to the task which devolved upon them; that after hearing the arguments each separately took the case and separately came to the conclusion which was come to in the award, and that award was therefore the unanimous expression of the

conclusions arrived at separately by each arbitrator. I do not cite this declaration of Sir Francis Hincks because it can have any bearing on the case, but simply for the purpose of protesting against assertions which are persistently made when they should not be made, because they have no foundation in fact. It is impossible to carry on the public discussions of this country if honorable gentlemen persist in basing arguments on assertions which are denied by the facts; but what, after all, is there in the assertion, if true, that the arbitrators have made a compromise? Supposing they made a compromise on the contentions submitted to them, what objection can the honorable gentlemen make to that fact? Honorable gentlemen opposite seem very tender-skinned on that question. They say that the boundaries between Ontario and Canada exist by law, and that the Parliament of Great Britain alone is the power that can change these boundaries. To this proposition I am disposed to assent, but if this boundary exists by law,

WHERE IS IT TO BE FOUND?

It exists by law, but the law is not clear upon that point; and, supposing the arbitrators made a compromise, does any one pretend to say that they thereby sacrificed the rights of Ontario or the rights of Canada? If the arbitrators had taken the contentions of either party and had said: "We will not admit the one proposition or the other; but will take a little from one side of the case and a little from the other." Who can say that they took away any rights that belonged to either? But whether or not this view be correct—whether the question was solved as a compromise or as a question of law—at all events there is the award, and it is binding unless you can show a better objection to it than has yet been brought forward. Of the award itself I will say nothing; it has been so ably defended by my honorable friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that it would be prepos-

terous in me to add a word to what he has said. Moreover, I do not see the necessity of defending it. It does not require to be defended, and the objections offered against it are of the most frivolous character; and, supposing the proposition now before the House should carry and that the question should be referred to the Supreme Court or Privy Council, does any one suppose that the decision of whatever tribunal it might be brought before would satisfy every one concerned? No, Mr. Speaker; there are objections to the award now, and there would be objections brought against the decision of any other tribunal before which it might be carried. I think it is Jean Jacques Rousseau who said that no two men ever discussed a question without each remaining more convinced of his own opinion than before the argument began. So it is in every law court. Where is the judge that can satisfy both parties? The loser always thinks that he has been wrongly treated. So it would be if this question were referred to the Supreme Court. I shall not touch upon the merits of the award, but I say it is an award

BINDING ON BOTH PARTIES,

and that it is the duty of both parties to receive it and carry it out in its entirety. In speaking thus, I am perfectly well aware that I shall be violently attacked in my own province by the members of the Conservative party.

Honorable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Laurier. I see that I have not mistaken the spirit of honorable gentlemen opposite. I see that I have not mistaken the views of my honorable friends opposite. I know their prejudices too well, not to know in advance what their argument will be; I know that it will be an appeal to the baser prejudices of my fellow-countrymen. But, Sir, I have too much respect for the justice of my countrymen to fear the effect of those appeals. Two years ago, when a motion

was made to appoint a Committee to investigate the award, I, in common with some of my friends on this side of the House, voted against such a Committee, because we believed then, as we believe now, that the question had been settled, and that it should not be again opened. We were attacked then, as we shall be attacked now; it was represented that we had sacrificed the interests of our province for the sake of Ontario. It would seem to these honorable gentlemen that to do justice to Ontario means to sacrifice the interests of Quebec. It must be remembered that this award grants nothing to Ontario but what Ontario had before; it does not pretend to give any additional territory to Ontario; it pretends simply to award to Ontario the territory to which she is entitled. But we were represented as the enemies of our province. Let me tell honorable gentlemen opposite, what I have often said elsewhere, that

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF TO-DAY

are not the party that were led at one time by Sir George Etienne Cartier.

Some honorable members :—Oh ! oh !

Mr. Laurier :—Will the honorable gentlemen, who now take so strong objection to my language, pretend that on this question they hold the views that were held by Sir George Cartier? Do they not know that Sir George Cartier, in many State papers signed by himself, granted to the province of Ontario far more territory than is granted to her by this award? In order that there may be no doubt on that point, let me refer them to the despatch signed by Sir George Cartier and his then colleague the honorable member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) on this very question. As honorable gentlemen remember, when the Dawson route was opened in 1869, strong objection was made by the Hudson's Bay Company against the Canadian Government opening a route through the territory between the Lake of the Woods and Red River

because they said it was invading their rights. To this Sir George Cartier and Mr. McDougall made a reply, in which they declared that, whatever doubt might exist as to the limits of old or French Canada, no impartial investigator could doubt that they extended to and included the country between the Lake of the Woods and Red River. I have no doubt that if Sir George Cartier were still leading his party he would hold the same opinion, and I venture to say that this question would never have been raised, but the award would have been carried out. If there was a quality for which Sir George Cartier deserved to be admired, it was his courage, and, next to his courage, his fairness to an adversary; and, knowing him as we once knew him, I say he would not have gone back on his word, but would have given whatever justice was due to Ontario; and I repeat again, that those gentlemen who are proposing to erect a monument to Sir George Cartier are slapping that very monument whenever they raise any objection against the award. I find that the honorable member for Halton, a few months afterwards, as well as Mr. Cauchon, in 1867, when he was a member of the Canadian Government, also took the ground that the territory extended

AS FAR AS RED RIVER.

If this question is referred to the Privy Council, in what position will the Canadian Government stand? They will stand in this position—that when it was to their interest, when they were fighting the Hudson's Bay Company, to claim that territory, they did so, and that now, when it is to their interest, they are asserting the very reverse. It may be that the Privy Council will hold their position to be legal, but certainly, if it is legal, it will be neither honorable nor dignified. But let me refer to the position of my fellow-countrymen from the province of Quebec. When it was asserted we were sacrificing the rights of our

province, it was objected that the territory of Ontario was already great and that this award made it still greater: and it was added that if a large population settled there Ontario would have a large preponderance of power in the Dominion. Now, let us suppose that the question is opened anew. The award may be set aside, and it may be that Ontario will be increased to the extent claimed as her right by the Dominion Government, or it may be that the territory of Ontario will be increased to the extent claimed by Ontario, and granted by Sir George Cartier, namely, to Red River—what then? You will have the province of Ontario made greater than it is by the award. As for a large population settling in that territory, does any one suppose that this will be realized for a hundred years to come? What immigration will go into the rocky country so long as the vast prairies in the North-West are to be filled up? The fear is perfectly chimerical.

THE WHOLE DISPUTE

lies in the interpretation of the Act of 1774. The honorable member for Bothwell argued that the province of Quebec, as constituted in 1774, was comprised within the following limits: To the east by the ocean, to the west by the Mississippi River, to the north by the Hudson Bay Territories, and to the south by the lines which have been described. On the other hand, it is contended by the honorable members for Niagara, Richmond and Wolfe, and Provencher, and in fact by all honorable members opposite who have spoken on this subject, that the term "northward" applies to a line to be drawn due north from the junction of the Mississippi with the Ohio; and that this astronomical line was to be the western boundary of the province. The honorable member for Bothwell argued forcibly that, if that contention were admitted, the province of Quebec, which was then constituted, was left without any boundary on the north. If this contention be

true, where is the northern boundary of Quebec to be found? If none was provided in the Act of 1774, it must be that established by the Royal Proclamation of 1763. In that case, it would be a line passing through the middle of Lake St John. This territory has always been claimed by the Province of Quebec, and at this moment the Government of that province are making great efforts to settle a large population there. I do not say the contention of the honorable member for Bothwell is right, but I say that, if you deny Ontario the boundary she claims, she may deny Quebec her northern boundary, and those sectional cries, which at one time were thought to be forever destroyed, would be renewed. The question having been settled ought to remain settled. There is no occasion to open it anew. I do not fear the appeal that will be made against me in my own province on the vote I intend giving. I have no hesitation in saying this award is binding on both parties, and should be carried out in good faith. The consideration that the great province of Ontario may be made greater I altogether lay aside as unfair, unfriendly, and unjust. This is not a question of expediency, it is

A QUESTION OF JUSTICE

I do not grudge to Ontario the extent of territory declared hers under this award, and which does not constitute even the whole of what she is entitled to, according to the opinion of one of the most learned and industrious of my countrymen. The eternal principles of justice are far more important than thousands or millions of acres of land, and I say, let us adhere to those principles of justice, and in so doing we will have the surest foundation for securing justice on every occasion.

A QUESTION OF AUTONOMY

THE RIGHT OF THE PROVINCES TO LEGISLATE AS REGARDS LICENSES

Is Confederation a disguised legislative union ?

In 1883, the Federal Government had attempted to take away from the provinces the right to legislate in the matter of licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors. This encroachment upon the rights of the Provincial Legislatures was so self-evident that,at the very next session(1884)a supporter of the Government itself, the late Mr. Houde, proposed the repeal, pure and simple of the usurping law. The following speech by Mr. Laurier on the occasion perfectly sums up the whole debate :

Mr. Speaker,

In view of what has been stated by my honorable friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé).I must refer to to the language which was made use of last year by the Government and contrast it with their language of to-day. It is within the recollection of everybody, and has been mentioned several times to-day,that last year the Government proposed this legislation, which it is now sought to repeal, under the absolute plea of necessity.The Prime Minister stated that there was no

law to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors; that all the laws which have been passed by the provinces were null and void, and that at any moment any man could open a shop, and there were no power on earth to prevent him from selling liquor. In view of the attitude taken by my honorable friend, the words of the First Minister, though they have been already quoted in this debate, will bear repetition. The Prime Minister then said:

> That subject was not willingly undertaken by the present Government. They were quite satisfied that the law, as it obtains in the different provinces, should be continued. They were quite satisfied that each province should, so far as the law would allow it to enact such statutes, deal with the subject of shop, tavern and saloon licences.

Then later, the right honorable gentleman, speaking of the decision in Russell and the Queen, said:

> Sir, if there be any value in that decision, and there is every value in it, because it is the law of the land, there is no check at the present moment, in the province of Ontario, against the unlimited, unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy: it is a matter of necessity. If we wish te prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors we must legislate immediately; for I take it, that any man in this city, or in any part of Ontario, can open his saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world can prevent his doing so.

Mr. Speaker, this was

VERY STRONG LANGUAGE.

and it was owing to this language that that law was put upon the Statute Book. It is within the knowledge of many members of this House that it was with the greatest reluctance that many supporters of the Government, especially those representing Quebec contituencies, voted for that law. They looked upon it as an infrigement upon the rights of the provinces. they looked upon it as an infringement of the power which rightly belong to the provinces. But when

they were told by so high a constitutional authority as the Premier of this Dominion that all the laws, which had hitherto regulated the trade in liquors, were null and void, that the provinces had absolutely no power to legislate upon this matter, that the only power to legislate upon this matter resided with this Parliament, that any man could open shop and sell without restraint, the consequences were appalling, and the prospect was such that they yielded to those considerations and enacted that law. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction, that had it not been for the strong language used by the Prime Minister, had he not given it

AS HIS DELIBERATE OPINION

—and his opinion was entitled to great credit—that the provinces had no right to legislate upon this matter, this bill would never have become law. But his authority was great with his followers. It was so great that it induced a great many of his followers to vote for that bill, against what they believed to be the best interests of the provinces. There can be no doubt, in view of what has since transpired, that that obnoxious legislation has been obtained, as it were, under false pretences. There can be no doubt that the opinion then expressed by the First Minister was wrong. It is now judicially established that the provinces have the power to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors. This cannot be longer disputed. No one can say, in view of the decision rendered in the case of Hodge, that the provinces have not the power to regulate the liquor trafic. On the contrary, the decision has been rendered upon that very point—it was the only question submitted to the Privy Council, and upon that very point the Privy Council has rendered a decision which is clear and manifest; and the decision is to this effect, that the regulation of the liquor traffic is within the powers assigned under the constitution to the provinces. It seems to me that, under such cir-

cumstances, when the Government declared last year that the only motive which impelled them to legislate, was that the Legislatures had no such power. they should have been sat sfied to leave the matter within their control. They should declare to the House that they have been in error and

WILL RESTORE THAT POWER

to the provinces. That course would seem to be obviously the correct one; yet what do we see? Do we see the Government rising in their places and saying: We thought the provinces had no power, but now we see that the provinces have the power? No; they say: we want to test whether we have not the same power as is possessed by the provinces. That is the position taken. I venture to say this: the true inwardness of this legislation is not to be found in Ministerial explanations or in the language of Ministers, but it is to be found in the Conservative press of Ontario. Anyone who has followed the Conservative press of Ontario for the last few years is aware that since the granting of licenses has been placed in the hands of commissioners appointed by the Provincial Government, complaints have been loud and frequent against that system. Complaints have been loud and frequent that the commissioners were partisans.

Some honorable members.:—Hear, hear!

Mr. Laurier:—I see the complaints are even repeated in this House. I believe that the true inwardness is not only to be found in the Conservative press of Ontario, but also in the following of the First Minister from Ontario.

If we have this law placed on the statute book, it is simply because these complaints have been loud and many. I am sure that every disappointed tavern-keeper who has been refused a license has declared that it was because he belonged to the Conservative party; that every low and dissolute man, whose application was refused, did not

place the reason at his own door, but at the door of the commissioners, and complained that the reason accusations were brought against him was because he was a Tory. The reason we have for this measure is

SIMPLY FOR PARTY GAIN

and advantage. It is to have the issue of licences placed in the hands of commissioners appointed by the Conservative Government. I believe if it were not for that consideration, we would not have had this law. The placing of the present law on the statute book is, in my opinion, an attack on the powers of the provinces. What is the amendment moved by the Minister of Public Works? It reads as follows:

> That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the question of the competency of Parliament to pass the Liquor License Act of 1883 should be submitted, with all convenient speed, to the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Conseil, or both.

Why is this amendment moved, I ask? Is there any doubt as to the power of the provinces to legislate upon this matter? I could conceive the propriety of the amendment, if it were still an open question as to whether the power to regulate the liquor traffic belongs to the provinces or to the Dominion. That was the question last year. But this year, in view of the decision rendered in the case of Hodge, can it be doubted any more, is it not, in fact, determined that the provinces at this moment have power to regulate the trade. Is it not now a certain fact that all the legislation passed by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec is law within those respective provinces? But the aim of the Government, which last year would have been satisfied to let the matter rest with the provinces, now wish it to be tested whether they themselves have not also the power which the provinces possess. What is the question involved in

the amendment? It is to determine whether the Act passed last session is law or not. I say, and I submit it to my colleagues, from Quebec especially, that the amendment is an assault on the rights of the provinces. We have this fact on the one hand, which should not be lost sight of, that at this moment and according to the decision in the case of Hodge

THE LEGISLATION OF THE PROVINCE

is law. If the amendment is carried, what will be the result? We will have the question submitted to the Privy Council as to whether the Act passed by the Dominion is not also law. It has been well argued by the honorable member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that the power to legislate upon this matter cannot be confirmed. If it rests with the provinces it cannot rest with the Dominion, and *vice versa*. It is now determined that it rests with the provinces. Suppose the question which it is intended to submit to the Privy Council be answered in the affirmative, and judgment be rendered that the law passed by the Dominion last year is valid and within the power of the Dominion Parliament—what then? The consequence will be that we shall have a double power having authority to deal with this matter—the power already admitted as being possessed by the provinces, and that which would exist in the Dominion. Then we would have two powers legislating concurrently in this matter the Dominion power and the Provincial power. If the Dominion has power to legislate in this matter and the provinces have the power also to legislate, what will be the consequence? The consequence will be that the legislation of the Dominion Government will override the legislation of the provinces, and the powers which the provinces now exercise must diminish. It is quite manifest that if this law, which it is intended to refer to the Privy Council, is an attribution of the Dominion, we will have two concurrent powers to legislate over this matter, and what would the conse-

quence be? The consequence must necessarily be that the power of the provinces would be curtailed by so much, that all the legislation which now exists in Ontario, Quebec, and the other provinces of the Dominion, would be overridden by this law, and the laws which are now administered by the provinces, to the benefit of those provinces, would be superseded by the Act passed last year, on the plea that they were compelled to pass that Act. Let us see the road we have travelled since last year. Last year the law was introduced as a matter of necessity; it was not a matter of policy. It was not the desire that the Dominion should have power to legislate over this matter; the Government were willing that that power should be retained by the provinces. But we find that what was last year a matter of necessity is this year

A MATTER OF POLICY,

and it is sought to have the question determined whether this Dominion cannot also have legislation in this matter. In my humble judgment, this is an infringement upon the powers of the provinces. It cannot be otherwise; and I ask the attention of those who value this Federal system, when I enquire if the object of the amendment is not, in the end, to deprive the provinces of the right which legitimately pertains to them to-day. Now, this is a serious matter, in my humble opinion. It is a step towards legislative union, as has well been said this afternoon. I say that every successful attempt made, on the floor of this Parliament, to deprive any province of any power now exercised by that province, however insignificant that power may be, is a successful step in the direction of legislative union. Now, I am well aware that legislative union is more in the favour of many members of this House than a federative union. I know that many honorable members would view the change to a legislative union without any alarm whatever.

For my own part, I believe that the federative system is the best of all systems which can be devised to govern this large territory. We are all aware that the fact of our having the present system of Confederation is largely due to the peculiar position of the province of Quebec; it is largely due to the fact that the elements to be united were not homogeneous. It is possible that if the elements had been homogeneous, the union would have been a legislative and not a federal one, but, whether or not, those elements were all homogeneous, I still submit that the best system,

THE ONLY SYSTEM

by which to govern this great territory, is a federative, and not a legislative union. Upon this question let me quote the opinion of a man whose ideas, I am sure, will commend themselves to, and whose authority will be respected by all the members of this House, and especially the members of French origin. I refer to Montesquieu, who, in his "Spirit of the Law" speaks thus:

> If a republic be small, it is destroyed by a foreign force; if it be large, it is ruined by an internal imperfection. To this twofold inconvenience democracies and aristocracies are equally liable, whether they be good or bad. The evil is in the very thing itself, and no form can redress it. It is, therefore, very probable that mankind would have been, at length, obliged to live constantly under the government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of constitution, that has all the internal advantages of a republican, together with the external force of a monarchical government. I mean a Confederate republic. This form of government is a convention by which several petty States agree to become members of a larger one, which they intend to establish. It is a kind of assemblage of societies, that constitute a new one, capable of increasing, by means of further associations, till they arrive to such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the whole body.

Now, it is to be remarked that at the time Mon-

tesquieu wrote these words, the world had not seen the large Confederation which has since sprung up on this continent. At the time he thus wrote, the only Confederacies which he touched upon in his book were the Dutch Confederacy, the Swiss Confederacy and the German Empire. Now all these three put together would not exceed in size one of our provinces, and any one of them singly would not exceed the size of one of our counties, and the dangers which he then foresaw, and which were obviated by this form of government, are magnified by the magnitude of our territory. According to that authority, it would be impossible to govern these large territories extending from one ocean to the other, by a single government, unless, indeed, that government were despotic, in which case

THERE WOULD BE RUPTURE.

But our system obviates all these difficulties; our municipal and provincial divisions, our Federal system, all these wheels within wheels constitute a mechanism, which is at once elastic and strong. Therefore, I say that this system is the best which can be devised. and it behooves every man in this Parliament, every friend of this country, to see that no attempt is made upon this form of government. I can well understand the conduct of the present Premier; but I confess I am surprised at the attitude taken by the Minister of Public Works and by some of the members from the province of Quebec. I can understand the attitude of the Premier, because I do not think it is slandering him to say that his preferences are not in favour of a federative union. I believe it is a matter of history that at the time the provinces were united, if that honorable gentleman had it in his power to stamp the constitution with his full mind, the bond of union would not have been a federative but a legislative one. It is a matter of history that the men whose ascendancy at the time

prevailed were Sir George Cartier and the Honorable George Brown. It is a matter of history that it was through their combined efforts that the constitution received the federative character which it did receive. They were both in favour of a federative union, and they were both at the head of large majorities, each one from his own section of the country, and their efforts prevailed in that direction. I believe I can also say that it is a matter of history that ever since, and especially since the honorable gentleman returned to power, he has endeavoured to forward legislation which is

GRADUALLY SUPERSEDING

the federative character of this union and making it a legislative union. The outward forms are maintained: no letter of the law is attacked, but gradually and surely new principles are introduced, new features are added, and, though the superstructure is untouched, there is underneath it an interpretation of the intent of that constitution which makes it just as much legislative in its character as if it had been so made and decreed. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Roman legislator never changed one single syllable of the law of the twelve tables; but, by means of edicts successively introduced, the Roman legislator introduced a new code of laws which, however, left the laws on the tables intact. The honorable gentleman is following a similar course, though with a less laudable object. The vetoing of numerous laws admittedly within the power of the provinces to enact, the present attempt to take from the provinces legislation which belongs to them, and which has judicially been determined to belong to them, the new Franchise bill, which we see looming up in the future, are all attempts in the same direction—in the direction of legislative union—and if all these measures are carried we will be nearer and nearer to a legislative union. If the same course is persisted in,

unless it is checked by the members of this House, we shall have by-and-by a Confederation in name, but a legislative union in fact; the Local Legislatures will be preserved, but they will be

SIMPLY COSTLY ORNAMENTS,

and nothing more. As I have said, I am not surprised at the conduct of the honorable Premier; he is consistent; he is true to himself. Whether acting consciously from design, or moved by the unconscious bent of his mind, I cannot say; but the fact is there, that he is all the time gradually approaching towards a legislative union. I am not surprised at his conduct, but I must say I would be surprised at the conduct of any member from the province of Quebec who would vote for the amendment now before the House. I would venture to say that if the great man who was instrumental in assisting to frame the Confederation, such as it exists, were still in his place, his work would not be demolished as it is now attempted to be; and I venture to say that, if the teaching which he instilled into the breasts of his followers remains with them still, this law will be repealed even this evening. It will, perhaps, be vain for me to invoke the testimony of the press. I did it once before, but in vain; but honorable gentlemean from the povince of Quebec are aware that the whole of their press, with one exception, are opposed to this liquor law. They all declare that it is an infringement upon Provincial rights. *La Minerve*, which is edited by my honorable friend from Ottawa, (Mr. Tassé) on the 18th of February, said:

It is certain that the Lords of the Privy Council have declared in their last judgment that a wrong interpretation had been placed upon the decision which they had rendered in the case of Russell, which had been taken as the basis of the law of 1883. Sir John A. Macdonald himself declared at the opening of the present session, that he had gone too far last year, adding, however, that he did not pretend to be infallible in

the matter of constitutional law. The interpretation which was given last year to the judgment rendered in the case of Russell was all the more unfortunate in that it undermined the very basis of our provincial institutions, and that the new law would have, amongst other results, that of depriving the Government of Quebec, in particular, that Government already so poor, of a revenue of $100,000, as Mr. Robertson declared at Sherbrooke. Under these circumstances, it is fortunate that the Privy Council now admits either that it had not expressed itself clearly or that its language was wrongly interpreted. This enables us to treat the law of 1883 in consequence.

Then another Provincial paper, Le *Canadien*, of the 7th of March, speaks thus:

When, for example, concerning the licence law, an undeniable infringement of our powers, we are appealed to on the ground of our party, on the ground of our sentiments of loyalty toward Sir John, we have reason to answer that the most sacred of all ties is the tie which binds us to our province, and that the want of loyalty would be in those who would persist in taking our rights from us. The License Law and the Franchise Bill, which Sir John has been endeavouring to impose upon us for the last two sessions, show with too much light the end toward which he aims, to make it possible for those who are opposed to legislative union to longer keep silent."

I could multiply these citations, but I will not do so. These are sufficient to show the tendency of the Conservative party. I address myself to honorable gentlemen opposite, and I appeal to them to maintain the constitution. In speaking as I now do, I do not want to be sectional. I would not make

ANY SECTIONAL APPEAL

on this as on any other occasion. When I ask my colleagues from the province of Quebec to vote in favour of the motion of my hon. friend from Maskinongé, I make no sectional appeal. It is an appeal in favour of the constitution, such as it is. All the provinces are interested in the integrity of the constitution, but no province so much as the province from which I come.

PARLIAMENTARY LIFE

LECTURE DELIVERED BY HONORABLE W. LAURIER

ON THE 19TH MAY, 1884, IN THE ROOMS OF "LA PATRIE" AT MONTREAL

MR. CHAIRMAN,
AND GENTLEMEN:

One must needs believe the evidence of his eyes, but, to believe it, he requires the evidence of his eyes. We have met this evening, on the invitation of a Liberal journalist, who receives us here, in Montreal, amid the hospitable surroundings of his own moveable and immoveable property. Indeed, nothing less was needed than the evidence of our own eyes to convince us of the existence of a fact so unusual in the history of the Liberal press of our race in this country.

Those who are aware that, previous to the foundation of *La Patrie* by Mr. Beaugrand, the Liberal press in this city only managed to exist through dint of constant sacrifices, as well as those who remember the drains on their purses to which it was necessary to resort in order to keep the life in *Le Pays* and *Le National*, will undoubtedly be as surprised as they are rejoiced at Mr. Beaugrand's success. Still more is he deserving of their thanks for the marked service he has thereby rendered to the Liberal party. He has proved that it is possible not only to publish, but to publish profitably a French Liberal paper.

Until lately, the prevailing impression was that

in this country, where education is still so little widespread, a French paper could not live save with the help of official subsidies and Ministerial favors, and, as the Liberal party, as well in as out of power, has always set its face against such methods, it was the general belief that the party's newspapers could only exist through the generosity of the friends of the cause. Once more, therefore, I say that Mr. Beaugrand has done the Liberal party a signal service by giving the death-blow to a humiliating notion and by showing that the best and surest resources of journalism are to be found among the people themselves.

Mr. Beaugrand's success certainly denotes on his part the possession of special aptitudes and first class administrative abilities.

The times, however, have changed, Liberal journalism in this province has now greater latitude, enjoys, so to say, a wider field and more elbow room than it had at even a comparatively recent date. Indeed, I doubt whether Mr. Beaugrand himself, if he had published *Le Pays* or *Le National*, would have been in a position to receive us as he is receiving us this evening.

The study of these social changes, which render possible to-day a success which was impossible only a few years back, would furnish an admirable subject for a lecture, but, as it would lead me on to one of the most irritating, if not most delicate, grounds of politics, I will, with Mr. Beaugrand's permission, reserve it for another occasion. For the present, I propose to go outside of politics, though I may, perhaps, fail to keep very far away from them.

I propose to speak to you of parliamentary life, not of public life, for the latter is already well enough known. During the three months of the session, which is its usual duration, what is said and what is done are published daily, commented upon, criticized, approved, blamed, by all the voices of modern publicity. I could say nothing on this subject which is not already well known by everybody. But there is

another aspect to the session : the inner or domestic aspect, which the press disdains to notice, which can only be observed on the spot and which is also not without instruction. It is this aspect to which I desire to call your attention.

It may, perhaps, not be misplaced, at the start, to say a word relative to the capital. The subject is a delicate one; I would not wish to say anything disparaging of the capital, but it is hard to say anything good of it. Ottawa is not a handsome city and does not appear destined to become one either. There is, however, in it one point of great beauty—the site of the Parliament Buildings, on a cliff rising up from the bed of the river, not far from the falls which have been rendered famous by the accounts of every traveller since Champlain.

This is Ottawa's only natural beauty. Behind the cliff, the land sinks into a monotonous plain, with a flat horizon unbroken by a single line.

The Parliament Buildings are in the Gothic style, and, in the opinion of connoisseurs, entitled to rank with the best architecture of Europe. They certainly have an admirable effect either when they break upon the sight bathed in the brilliant light of the summer sun or when seen on a dark winter's night illuminated from within by the floods of light, which shine in capricious arabesques through their many ogival windows.

But, despite their unquestionable beauty, these buildings are badly adapted to the purpose for which they were intended. The Gothic style, always admirable in outward effect, renders the interior dark and cold, and it may be said that this style was badly suited to the kind of buildings in which air and light should circulate as freely as possible. As Mr. Mackenzie said one day, these buildings were splendidly adapted for a monastery, but never for a legislative assembly.

However, therein once a year meet the Senate and Commons of Canada. The opening of Parliament is always a great event for Ottawa. It invariably excites

the whole population, but they by no means monopolize the excitement, as the city is always crowded on such occasions with strangers from all parts of the country.

The official ceremonies are announced to take place at three in the afternoon. But, from eleven in the forenoon, the crowd begins to gather on the grounds and by three o'clock the latter are completely filled. In 1879, as early as ten o'clock in the morning, the doors of the Senate Chamber were besieged by a crowd anxious to get a good view of the Princess Louise.

Moreover, these opening ceremonies are not lacking in grandeur and are certainly curious to behold.

These old customs and antique solemnities, transplanted from another world to our modern and democratic midst, and connecting the middle ages with our contemporary epoch, open up all the pages of history from the day on which William the Conqueror landed on the shores of England down to the day on which a royal princess, descended from the blood of William, comes to take her place in these old ceremonies, which were carried by the Conqueror from Normandy into England and imported from England to this continent, in the midst of a population a large portion of whom have themselves been detached from the land which was the cradle of William the Conqueror.

It is to the Senate Chamber goes the Governor. This chamber is very fine and of the same size and architecture as that of the Commons, but the draperies and furniture are in excellent taste and give it a stamp which is altogether missed from the Commons' chamber. On this occasion, however, the Senate Chamber is resplendent. Ladies are admitted to the floor and appear in full dress; the judges of the Supreme Court are present in their scarlet robes bordered with ermine; and the Cabinet Ministers attend in their gold-laced uniforms. I do not admit, however, that all this scarlet and gold lace is to my taste.

I would prefer to see the judges in the ordinary silk robes, which are plain, it is true, but not wanting in dignity, and, as for the gold-laced uniforms, they may be suited to Westminster, but, in this democratic country, the simple black coat unquestionably appears better. I have already said that the ceremony is fixed for three o'clock, and, between the official hour and the practical hour, the old Senators attempt to indulge in innocent flirtations with their fair guests.

At last, the Governor has arrived amid the usual enthusiastic cheering and taken his seat on the Throne. He desires the presence of his "faithful Commons".

And, during this time, what are the faithful Commons doing? Having nothing to do, they have endeavored to be as noisy as possible.

Nothing resembles a school more than Parliament. Nothing is more like the reopening of the classes than the opening of Parliament. Despite the ten months of confinement to follow, the day of reopening of the classes is always a gay one, and the same may be said of the day of the opening of the session. The pleasure of meeting each other again, the almost ceaseless handshaking, the exchange of more or less spicy jokes, all are to be found in Parliament just the same as in school, on opening day.

But, hark! to the three knocks at the chamber door. The Sergeant-at-Arms goes to see what's the trouble, just as if he was not quite well aware beforehand. He returns grave and solemn to announce to the Speaker that a messenger from the Senate is waiting at the door, and with no less gravity and solemnity the Speaker answers: "Let the messenger enter!"

The messenger enters. It is the Usher of the Black Rod, the chief officer of the Senate, who comes to announce that the Governor General desires the presence of the Commons in the Senate Chamber. Before opening his mouth, he advances nine steps,

making three bows as he proceeds, and, having delivered his message, he backs out, repeating the same number of steps and of bows, wheels on his heels and disappears, invariably accompanied by a formidable clapping of hands from all parts of the chamber.

John Bull seems to take a perennial pleasure in seeing these bows made by a man paid to make them, and the same remark is repeated every year: "Well, it is worth the money!".

Then, like so many unruly boys, the members rush in a troop to the Senate Chamber. Their least anxiety, however, is to listen to His Excellency's speech. They leave that duty to the Speaker, who discharges it most religiously.

I have used the term Speaker in alluding to the president or chairman of the House of Commons. I am not ignorant of the long controversy, which took place in the press over the rendering into French of the English word "Speaker," but it is not my intention to mix myself up with it, as I have no desire to add another to the list of snarling critics to whom the country has given birth. It is simply wonderful how many literary critics we have, when we have so little literature.

But, in spite of all the snarling critics, I persist in translating the word "Speaker" by the French word "Orateur;" to translate the word "Speaker" by the word "president" reminds me of the time when I was a student here and when it was said that an eminent lawyer, who came across the word "by-and-by" in a letter, vehemently maintained that it meant "to-morrow."

The reason assigned for translating the word "Speaker" by the word "president" is that it would be a counter-sense to call him the Speaker, since he takes no part in the debates and since his functions consist in presiding over the chamber. But those who take this ground do not reflect that, if it was a counter-sense in French to say *Orateur*, it would also be a

counter-sense in English to say "Speaker." In the English language, there is an absolute equivalent for our word *President;* it is the word "president" and, if they do not use it to designate the person presiding over the House of Commons, there must be a reason for it.

I have noticed that those affected puritans who persist in calling the Speaker president usually belong to the school which makes a great display of its principles and systematically curses modern France.

I naturally conclude that they must at least have read the good authors of the age of Louis XIV. They are well aware that, on every page, there is an allusion to the sovereign of what was then the duchy of Bavaria, and who nevertheless is never styled the "Duke," but the "Elector" of Bavaria.

Would it not be also a counter-sense, in the eyes of our critics, to designate the sovereign of this duchy as an elector? But the reason for it is that the sovereign of the duchy of Bavaria was at the same time an elector of the Holy Empire and that this quality took precedence over the other. Under the old organization of the Empire, there was in Germany a crowd of small principalities, whose rulers, like the duke of Bavaria, had the title of Elector as their principal title.

This title of Elector formerly carried great weight in Germany, and even yet the word has an imposing sound in German ears, if we are to credit the capital joke which Henry Labouchère lately played on them and which those worthy Germans seem to have unhesitatingly swallowed. Arriving in one of the German towns, the name of which I cannot now recall, the editor of *Truth* boldly entered himself in the hotel register as Henry Labouchere, Elector of Middlesex.

I cannot say whether it was from force of historical reminiscence or from extravagant admiration for the parliamentary system which Bismarck never doles out except with a niggardly hand to the subjects

of King William, but it is certain that the title of Elector won for Mr. Labouchère a host of little attentions, which the German innkeepers are not in the habit of wasting upon travellers.

If the English give the title of Speaker to the president of their legislative assemblies, there is also a good reason for it, namely, that the president of the House is at the same time the interpreter with the Sovereign of the body over which he presides. He speaks for the members. He is their speaker.

Thus, suppose that general elections have taken place. The House of Commons has no Speaker as yet. The members proceed to the Senate Chamber to hear the opening Speech from the Throne; but His Excellency causes it to be intimated to them that he does not deem it advisable to make known the causes for which he has summoned Parliament until the Commons have elected a Speaker.

Summoned again on the following day to the Senate Chamber, the members troop back to it pretty much in the same disorderly fashion as on the previous day. The newly elected Speaker alone wears an air of gravity, because he has a speech to make and nothing conduces so much to seriousness as to make a speech in those vast halls, whose severe architecture chills one to the marrow. It is now that we get the opportunity to understand why the English, who are noted for their practical good sense, apply the name of Speaker to the president of the House of Commons. He is, in fact, the speaker of those who have elected him. In their name he addresses the Sovereign and his speech is both respectful and dignified. Here it is:

May it please Your Excellency:

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to perform the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me

and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges; especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your Excellency's person at all ceasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from Your Excellency their most favorable interpretation.

At the prorogation of the House, the Speaker again addresses the representative of the Sovereign, in presenting the Supply Bill, and the following is the language which he uses on that occasion:

May it please Your Excellency:

The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a bill intituled "An act to grant to Her Majesty certain sums of money to defray certain expenses of the public service during the fiscal year commencing on the....." and to which I ask Your Excellency's assent.

The reply is in these terms:

"In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this bill."

All these old ceremonies may seem absurd; but in reality they are not. The most of them have a deep meaning and possess historical value, recalling as they do a triumph over absolutism and the progression towards that complete liberty now involved in our parliamentary system.

Thus, when the Speaker of the Commons presents the Supply Bill to the Sovereign, he recalls the fundamental principle of the people's right to govern themselves and to permit none other to tax them but themselves.

It may be urged, perhaps, that these old ceremo-

nies are only the expression of principles which are not questioned by any one at present and that the time has arrived to adopt simpler methods of parliamentary procedure and more in keeping with the modern spirit. I am not too sure of this.

I am Liberal in principle, but Conservative in sentiment. I confess to this weakness. I cherish a respect for these old solemnities, which are not harmful in themselves and which have only the demerit of having outlived their time.

Nevertheless, my words only apply to the Federal Parliament. I have already said that, at Ottawa, these ceremonies are not without a certain grandeur. The Legislature there is numerous enough and the pomp rich enough to impart to them a certain splendor. But, at Quebec, the same ceremonies have always seemed to me very grotesque. Moreover, the legislative body of twenty-four members, which is supposed to there represent the House of Lords, the house at Spencer Wood, which is supposed to represent the royal castle of Windsor, and all those attempts of our Local Government to ape royalty appear to me very comical, to say the least.

I am certainly far from wishing to belittle our local legislatures. Quite the contrary. The attributes of the local legislatures are of the highest importance. But at the same time their resources are small and their revenues very limited, and, from this standpoint, it seems that the local legislatures should glory rather in plebeian simplicity.

To imitate royalty at Ottawa is in keeping with the fitness of things; to ape it at Quebec is absurd.

Setting aside all political preferences and leaving out Mr. Letellier's grand figure, I hold that, of all our lieutenant-governors, Sir Narcisse Belleau was the one who came nearest to perfection. During the five years in which he was called to discharge the functions of chief magistrate of the province, Sir Narcisse Belleau never sought either to pose as a king or to dazzle the ninnies. He would never consent to

reside at Spencer Wood. He said, perhaps, rightly, that Spencer Wood was too expensive for the means of a private citizen and he disdained to throw the cost of its maintenance on the State. He lived on St Louis street like a worthy bourgeois of the good city of Quebec. In the morning he made a tour of the markets; in the evening, he went to breathe the fresh air on the Terrace. Like the king of Yvetot, rising late and lying down early, he lived very well without glory.

These democratic ways remind one of the governors of the New England States who spend the forenoon at the Government house despatching the public business and the afternoon at their own offices attending to their own affairs.

Sir Narcisse committed only one mistake during his administrative career and that was in going to open the session in a hat decorated with cock's feathers, and a gold-laced coat, between two files of policemen stationed at least thirty feet from each other and supposed to represent a hedge for the protection of his person. In my opinion, he would have been perfect, if on opening days he had had the courage to button up his overcoat, take his cane in his hand, and walk to the Buildings to read to the two Houses the lesson which in parliamentary language is styled the Speech from the Throne.

But I am straying pretty far from my subject. I return to it.

The Governor has opened the session by a speech to the two Houses, and they reply by an address, so that there is an exchange of courtesies. Before the address is presented to the Sovereign it must be adopted by each of the two Houses. In the House of Commons the task of proposing and seconding the address is usually entrusted to the youngest members. I have just used the word "second." Here again is a word which grates on the nerves of a certain class of critics. They want us to say "appuyer" (support.) I call their attention to the fact that the English verb "to second" comes from the French

verb "*seconder*" and that there assuredly cannot be a better translation than the etymological meaning of the word to be translated. I would ask them to also note that all those expressions: address, seconded. Speech from the Throne, motion, found their way into the parliamentary language of England at a time when the official language of England was the French language and that later when the Saxon race had absorbed the conquerors and that English once more became the language of the nation, all these expressions were literally translated from French into English.

By a strange fortune, while these expressions have lost in France their technical meaning owing to to the disappearance of the institutions to which they were adapted, the descendants of France on this continent are destined to restore them to the language. In fact, is it not a labor of love to revive these old expressions as they were conveyed from France to England by the Normans?

The moving and seconding of the address is an honor alike desired and feared. Indeed, there are few more ungrateful tasks. The speaker has to comment on the Speech from the Throne, which is his text, so to say, and it would be difficult to find one more dry or barren—it being one of the usages of Parliament to place in His Excellency's mouth a tissue of commonplaces dressed up in the dullest style imaginable. His Excellency is happy to meet again the members of the Senate and the Commons: he thanks Providence for the bountiful harvest with which the country has been blessed; the Ministerial policy is yielding satisfactory results; bills will be submitted for this or that purpose; the public accounts will be laid before the Commons, and lastly His Excellency invokes the blessings of Heaven on the labors of his Parliament. The drafting of this masterpiece is always a subject of joking at the Council board, and when the Premier lays before his colleagues the draft he has elaborated, they are always in humorous vein

and it is a contest between them to see who will make the most laughable remark.

The unlucky young man, to whom this outline is handed, does not feel quite so much pleasure and despairingly asks himself what he can find to say on such a subject.

He can, however, always count upon an indulgent audience. The old Parliamentarians naturally look for some rambling on his part and some soaring from the earth into the clouds, and smile a little in advance at these ambitious flights; but, if the substance of his remarks be sensible and if he eschew the pompous and the trivial, he wins a legitimate success and is sincerely applauded.

Is it now the turn of the Opposition leader to speak—his task being to review the Government's policy as set forth in the Speech from the Throne.

He invariably begins by complimenting the movers of the address. This is sometimes difficult, as the movers are not always successful. I have always, however, admired this delicate portion of the Opposition leader's speech, whether the speaker was Sir John, Mr. Mackenzie or Mr. Blake, each of them seeming to know how to award delicate praise without falling into improper flattery.

On ordinary occasions, the Opposition leader's tone is one of banter. He does not give battle, but merely contents himself with harassing the enemy and affecting to be a good fellow; he lays bare the Government's weak points, but does so without bitterness, seeming to say to the majority: Look at the Government you are supporting; see it as it is and make the most of it; there is plenty room to do so. His own supporters are jubilant; they laugh and applaud and every fresh shaft tickles and cheers them. On the other hand, the Ministerialists begin by smiling, but end by thinking that they are getting too much of that sort of thing.

At last, the Premier's turn comes and he replies in the same tone. The laughter and fun are now on

the Ministerial side. Still, on both sides, the weapons on that day are blunt, unless, indeed, the Opposition leader deems the occasion opportune to offer an amendment.

In that case, the voices become sharp and the weapons are cutting. At Ottawa, since Confederation, there has been only one amendment proposed to the address and that was by Mr. Mackenzie in 1873 relative to the Pacific scandal, when the fall of the Government ensued.

I have just referred to the manner in which the leaders of the two parties are greeted. Among the many qualities which render them so apt in parliamentary government, the English possess one of rare merit for the application of that form of government. They know how to listen and to be tolerant. It is not in the ardent temperament of the French to respect the convictions of others. What the Frenchman conceives, he conceives with so much intensity that he cannot admit the possibility of others thinking differently from him.

This is not the case with the Englishman. He has his own convictions, but he is neither astonished nor irritated because you differ from him. On the contrary, he is prepared for this eventuality and expects that the diversity of opinions will be as great as the diversity of intellects and of faces. He would cordially despise you if he thought you had no opinions of your own. In fact, while the Frenchman wants you to have his opinions, the Englishman wants you to have opinions of your own.

See what happens in the legislative body in Paris! There is an orator in the tribune! His adversaries cannot keep quiet. From all points of the Chamber arise interruptions and protests and frequently the confusion becomes so great that the president cannot control it.

Look on the other hand at our House of Commons! It supports the most furious attacks without wincing and no one dreams of interrupting, unless

the orator permits interruption. Nevertheless, the attack is keen, violent and often bitter. The orator's friends applaud; his adversaries do not budge; when they believe that the attack is fair warfare and that, from his standpoint, he is right, they endure without wincing; but if he exaggerates they emphasize the exaggeration by ironical applause. If he falls into misstatement, the faces relax as there is nothing to fear, and if, lastly, he grows paradoxical, he receives every latitude and the House listens with the feeling which the English characterize as "amused wonderment."

This is what happens at Ottawa, where the House is in great part English, but also in part French. Still even in the House of Commons, we French Canadians do not know how to bear contradiction like our fellow citizens of British origin.

But, after all, we are in this respect superior to our cousins across the sea. We can listen to an adversary and sit still, but we cannot listen to him with complete coolness. We can occasionally, but rarely, acknowledge his talents; but we can never render justice to his thesis. According as he speaks in favor or against our opinion, his utterances are absurd or sublime.

The English are more sober in expression. When we have heard one of Mr. Blake's speeches, we give vent to our enthusiasm in metaphors; but the great orator's warmest admirers among his own countrymen content themselves with saying: "that was a great speech of Blake's."

On the other hand, if an adversary has made a successful hit, instead of saying that his statements were absurd, they simply say: "that was well put from his standpoint."

If the French were gifted with this frankness of expression and tolerance of opinion, the courtesy of their discussions would be marked. It is not so with the English. Their discussions are never vulgar, but on the other hand they are never gracious and always

lack that urbanity which respects your feelings as your life.

The Englishman respects your opinions; but he never thinks of your feelings.

The capital point on which we differ from our fellow citizens of British origin is our idea of politics.

For us, sons of France, political sentiment is a passion; while, for the Englishmen, politics are a question of business.

The only thought of the English members in going to Ottawa is that they are called there to discuss and decide the affairs of the country, just as the shareholders of a bank are called to discuss and decide the affairs of the bank.

I say the affairs of the country, and I purposely use this unusual expression in our language. When I say the affairs, I use the word in its restricted sense, as the equivalent of the word "business".

According to the English notion, the affairs of the country, like those of a private individual, comprise the revenue, expenditure and all the cognate questions; and it is needless to remind my hearers that these questions of revenue and expenditure fill the largest place in our Federal politics.

We, of French origin, understand politics quite otherwise. Tariff and revenue questions are not our chief preoccupation. We rather incline towards the speculative and have a fondness for theories.

Now look at the different results in the case of the two races! Take an ordinary man in any rank whatever of English society! He knows the figure of the public expenditure, and of the receipts; he can tell you the yield of the customs and excise, and he is conversant with every item of the tariff.

Now, how many are there among us, even among those who shout loudest at election time, who have taken the slightest trouble to post themselves on these heads? We know, however, that they are thoroughly acquainted with all the discussions on the school uestion, on the relative value of the different forms

of government, on the theories of divine right, on the union of Church and State, and on a host of other abstract questions, which have no application to our politics and which have never been discussed in any of our legislative assemblies.

The House of Commons is, above all, a meeting of business men and business questions are there treated. At least, three fourths of the proceedings are carried on by means of conversations exchanged across the floor of the House, without preparation, and without effort of eloquence.

The strangers, who come to the capital to hear the debates, are usually disappointed. They expect to hear great eloquence; they simply hear business discussions.

Nevertheless, some of these discussions are really eloquent. For instance, a Ministerial question of great importance is to be treated. Sir Charles Tupper is to explain the Government's policy. He will be followed by Mr. Blake and the fight will then become general. Unconsciously, the House takes on a particular physiognomy. Every member is at his post. There is not a vacant seat. The galleries are full and, on every face, sits a look of expectation.

The debate is opened by two master speeches, as diametrically different from each other as are the orators themselves and yet visibly of the same school and of a unique style of eloquence.

This style of eloquence is what we term English parliamentary eloquence.

What we, of French race and education, appreciate and enjoy the most is that nervous, magnetic eloquence which stirs the soul and brings a choking sensation to the throat and water to the eyes, or, again that academic eloquence, pure in language and elegant in diction, which fills the ear with a music that tends more to charm than to convince.

French eloquence is above all æsthetic. English eloquence is above all practical.

The great aim of the English orator is to go

straight to the point. He has a proposition to uphold and he piles up arguments, figures, comparisons, quotations, everything, in fine, that is calculated to bolster it up. He does not seek to please, but if he succeeds in dazzling your reason, in inundating it with a flood of light, and rendering luminous what was obscure, he has won the success he coveted.

This eloquence is not soul-stirring and possesses none of those oratorical movements which strike the hearer like an electric shock: but when an orator like Mr Blake carries you on with him into the intellectual realms, lifts you to inaccessible heights, and unfolds to your eyes new horizons, which are immediately replaced by others still higher, emotion slowly, gradually creeps upon you, takes possession of you and finally subjugates you altogether.

My hearers may, perhaps, be curious to learn something of the leading orators of the House.

I have just mentioned the name of Mr Blake. The leader of the Opposition is beyond question the foremost orator of the House. His eloquence borrows nothing from the ordinary means of the orator: it emanates entirely from a single source: intellectual force. Mr. Blake has without doubt one of the most extraordinary mental organizations that are to be found at present in the world. His powerful intelligence takes in everything. His grasp covers the whole as well as the details. All the outlines of the vastest political problem are perfectly clear to him; [illegible] points of the most difficult [illegible] escapes him. When he treats a subject, he exhausts it; when he leaves it, there is nothing [illegible] to reply, and when at length [illegible] his seat, his partisans are jubilant and even his adversaries cannot help expressing their admiration.

Sir John A. Macdonald's style is quite different. Singular to say, in the case of so alert a mind, he lacks happiness and [illegible] of expression. He hesitates, stammers and repeats himself, he is incorrect, but,

in all his speeches, there is always a nail that goes straight home. He excels in seizing upon an adversary's weak point. His highest art, however, consists in saying exactly what should be said to produce the most effect on his own supporters. He knows all their weaknesses and their prejudices and all he says is perfectly adapted to them.

Sir Charles Tupper's chief characteristics are force and, above all, audacity. He is the Danton of the House. He speaks with all the abundance, vehemence and rush of the torrent. The more desperate is the cause he has to defend, the greater is his audacity. He asserts the most untenable propositions with a coolness and an imperturbability which no question, no interruption, can discountenance. Far from that, if an interruption to the point demolishes on the spot an over risky assertion, instead of beating a retreat even to the extent of a hair's-breadth, he invariably exclaims : "I am thankful for the interruption, as it proves exactly what I have just said." And then he goes on to repeat all he has already said, with redoubled energy, argument and vigor.

Mr. Mackenzie's voice is, unhappily, no longer heard. This is an immense loss for the country and an irreparable one for the Liberal party. Mr. Mackenzie had all the force of Sir Charles Tupper, without his fire; but, for that reason, his eloquence was, perhaps, not less effective. In all his words, there was a concentrated power which went to the very marrow. Let us pray that this valiant mind, this blameless character, may soon be restored to health and resume the leading position which he has filled and which belongs to him of right in his country's legislature. There is no man less known than Mr. Mackenzie and there has been none more slandered. While in power he was systematically represented as a fanatic and as a man with narrow and intolerant views. Nothing could be falser. Mr. Mackenzie is a Liberal with the greatest breadth of ideas. I believe that, while he was Premier, he was somewhat em-

bittered by the systematically unfair attacks of which he was the victim and by his superhuman and self-imposed labors, but I can state from a personal knowledge extending over a number of years that there are few men easier and more agreeable to deal or associate with. The savage man, as he was represented to the public, is on the contrary full of humor and always has a laughing word on his lips.

Like Mr. Mackenzie, Sir Richard Cartwright is a man whom the tongue of slander has represented under false colors. In private life, Sir Richard is one of the most accomplished gentlemen it is possible to meet, affable, polite and distinguished by a regular Attic grace. As may be imagined, however, his adversaries do not like him. His tongue is the most formidable in the whole House. On the other hand his eloquence is, perhaps, the most classic. His language is always correct, precise, clear, and eloquent, but at the same time biting and cutting. I said a moment ago that the English know how to listen without wincing, but it is nevertheless not rare to see the British phlegm unable to resist Sir Richard Cartwright's attacks and I have often seen his adversaries writhing with anger under his elegant lash.

Is it not generaly known that Sir Richard Cartwright is a lettered man. Indeed he is not only a lettered man, but a literary dilettante. During the long sittings of the House, when the debate does not interest Sir Richard, a messenger brings him a select volume from the library, aud then, with his hat down over his eyes, he becomes absorbed in its perusal and as indifferent to what is going on around him as if he was in his own study.

Mr. Blake is also a lettered man; in fact, he may be said to be even a glutton in the matter of literature.

Notwithstanding the herculean work he undertakes during the session, he keeps himself regularly posted in current literature and reads everything that is published. Said one of the officials of

the library to me last session:—" Mr. Blake is an omnivorous reader; we send him everything that comes in. "—" Tell me "—I said to him—" where does he find the time to read?"—" It is a mystery, Sir, but he reads everything. "

What I have thus far stated has shown you that, although there are about fifty French members in the House of Commons, it is exclusively an English assembly. French is its official language as well as English, but French is being less and less spoken in it. The reason for this is that it is impossible to take an effective part in the debates unless you use the language of the majority. This fact was only lately thrown up to me by a man of great talent, great sense and ardent patriotism, but I do not admit the reproach. Things must be taken as they are. Our parliamentary laws, usages, and customs come to us from England. Moreover, the English are better adapted than we are for that system of government. In no matter what deliberative assembly they may find themselves, they are more at home than are the French, and, where they are in the majority, their language must necessarily prevail.

On the other hand we, of French origin, are essentially an artistic people, and if I had an advice to give to my fellow countrymen, it would be to remain true to their origin and to cultivate that taste for the arts and letters which we inherit from France and in which we ought to take on this continent the place filled by France in Europe.

The force of circumstances is such that in America the English tongue will always be the language of the million and our ambition should be to make French, here as elsewhere, the language of predilection, good company and polite society.

Another Question of Provincial Autonomy

UNITY OF THE FRANCHISE THROUGHOUT THE DOMINION

VIGOROUS STRUGGLE OF THE OPPOSITION AGAINST CENTRALIZATION

MR. LAURIER'S PLEA AGAINST THIS ENCROACHMENT

The session of the Federal Parliament in 1885 lasted six months. Opened on the 29th January, it was only prorogued on the 20th July—its unusual prolongation being mainly due to the Franchise Bill. The Opposition disputed the ground inch by inch and only yielded in the end to the numerical strength of their opponents. Their objections will be found summed up with extraordinary force in the following speech made by Mr. Laurier at the sitting of the 17th April, 1885 :

MR. SPEAKER,

During the discussion yesterday, the fact was brought several times to the memory of the House that this is not the first time the honorable gentleman has endeavored to force this measure upon the people of this country. In fact, during the nearly eighteen years that this Confederation has lasted, the honorable gentleman has made seven attempts to establish a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion, but each time he has been forced to abandon the attempt.

Six times before has he brought in a bill of this nature, and has either withdrawn it, or been obliged to let it drop after carrying it to a certain stage. Now it may be asked, what is the reason that he has made these numerous and persistent attempts to force this measure upon the country? The reason is simply this—that the right honorable gentleman has set his heart upon this measure which, being one of centralization, and antagonistic to the federal principle of our constitution, is quite congenial to his well known principles. But while he has endeavored to push his followers onward, they have each time failed to pass it for the reason that their hearts were not in the cause. Public opinion never responded to calls that were made upon this measure, though he stated that public opinion is ripe for it. Sir, if public opinion is ripe for it,

WHERE ARE THE EVIDENCES OF IT?

Public opinion generally manifests itself either by petitions at the bar of this House, or by resolutions of public meetings, or through the press. Now, where are the petitions that have been presented in favor of it? Not one has been presented this session that I am aware of. Where have public meetings been held in favor of a Dominion franchise? I defy the honorable gentlemen to point out one instance where any public meeting has passed a resolution to that effect, As to the press, while I cannot speak as to the other provinces, so far as my own province is concerned, far from expressing itself in favor of a Dominion franchise,such a scheme has been denounced as inimical to our institutions—not only by the Opposition press, but by the Ministerial press itself. The fact is that, ever since Confederation, we have had a provincial franchise upon which the members of this House have been elected, and I am not aware that any complaint has ever been made against that arrangement. The steady conviction of the people

seems to have been, on the contrary, that this provincial franchise was the best suited to our institutions, and under all circumstances was best adapted to the character of our people. I have said that this measure is now introduced for the seventh time into this House, but it has been

DISCUSSED ONLY ONCE—

in 1870. At that time it was discussed at some length. The bill was carried to its second reading, and taken into Committee of the Whole. But the discussion was somewhat desultory; most of the members who spoke upon it did not seem to see their way very clearly. They did not seem to have made up their minds as to what necessity there was for it. At that time Confederation was quite recent and the relative functions of the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures were not as clearly understood as they are to-day; and consequently the general discussion was somewhat desultory. But when the measure was in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Dorion moved an amendment in favor of a provincial franchise. His amendment was to this effect: That the electors for the House of Commons shall be those who are entitled to vote at any election for the representation in the Local Legislatures; and that opinion seems to have met with the general consent of the House,—at all events, no attempt was made to contradict that amendment or oppose it. The only member, who spoke after Mr. Dorion was my honorable friend, the present leader of the Opposition, who supported the amendment. The right honorable gentleman moved the adjournment of the debate, and that debate never was resumed. The measure was shelved, not again to be resurrected until the dust of twelve long years had accumulated upon it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the right honorable gentleman again proposes to change the existing state of things, and to substitute a uniformity of franchise.

Now, what are the reasons for this change? We should have had some explanations on these points, but the Government have been perfectly dumb. Up to the present day each province has had

ITS OWN FRANCHISE.

Quebec has had its own franchise, and a very liberal franchise it has been—not universal, but with very large limits, indeed. Ontario has had her franchise, still more liberal, I think, than that of Quebec. Prince Edward Island has had a universal franchise. Each of the members now present in this House has been elected upon the particular franchise of the province from which he comes. And has any complaint ever been made either in this House, or in any other part of the Dominion, that an injustice is being done against the provinces, or against the people of any province by the present franchise? I am not aware that any complaint has been made; if this system has worked well and satisfactorily, I ask why is this measure introduced? We, Sir, on this side of the House, are reformers. We do not believe in the immutability of human institutions: we believe in their perfectibility; but at the same time we would not alter any existing institutions unless some good was to be effected by it, unless some ill was to be remedied. But it seems that gentlemen of the Conservative persuasion— at least in this House—are of a different opinion. I gathered yesterday from a remark made by the honorable member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that the Conservative party in this House were ready to vote this measure without the slightest hesitation. I should suppose that a good Conservative, a strong Tory, would not like to alter existing institutions unless some reasons were given for the change. But the honorable gentleman said that they were waiting for the members of the Opposition to state their objections to the measure. It seems to me that it would have been more proper, first of all,

for the Government to have given some reason why the existing state of things should be changed. But it seems that honorable gentlemen opposite are ready to vote for this measure without asking any questions, even before the Liberal members have raised any objection to it; and I really believe they will be still more ready to vote for it, even after unanswerable objections have been made against it.

THE ONLY REASON

which has been advanced by the right honorable gentleman in introducing this measure in favor of a Dominion franchise—if it be a reason at all - was that our present franchise was an anomaly, that we ought to have a uniformity of franchise all over the Dominion. Well, I do not admit that it is an anomaly for each province to have its own franchise. But supposing it to be so, I should not suppose that the honorable gentlemen would have been so tender-hearted upon that score, because I believe, and perhaps he will admit himself, that in the course of his long political career he has been guilty of many sins of anomaly. Let me refer him to one glaring instance. Under our constitution we have a separation of powers. The local legislatures are properly entrusted with the establishment of courts of justice, and they are also to determine the number of judges of which the courts are to be composed, and very properly should, but the judges are to be paid by the Dominion Parliament, and this Parliament has no control at all over the establishment of the courts which it has to pay for, or over the number of the judges for whose salaries it has to provide. Can there be

A WORSE ANOMALY THAN THIS?

Can there be a more glaring lack of uniformity?

The provincial legislatures establish the courts. It is in their power to appoint one, or two, or three,

or four, or ten judges, and this House has no control over them, though we are obliged to pay them immediately after they are appointed by the local legislatures. Can there be a greater anomaly? Yet the father of this anomaly is the right honorable gentleman himself. Why did he do it? I do not blame the right honorable gentleman for having done it. Perhaps it is right that he should have done it. Perhaps the right honorable gentleman remembered at the time the language of Burke, which is to this effect:

> Government has been deemed a practical thing, made for the happiness of mankind, and not to furnish a spectacle of uniformity to justify the scheme of visionary politicians.

Perhaps the honorable gentleman well remembered that sentence when he created the anomaly which stands to-day in our constitution. But if he remembered it then, why does he not remember it now? If the practical necessities of the government demand such an anomaly as that to which I have just referred, is it inconsistent that the anomaly complained of should still exist in the working of the constitution? That is the only reason which has been given for instituting the change which it is now sought to introduce. The constitution is not uniform, and we cannot have uniformity. Undoubtedly it would be far preferable if we could have a uniform franchise. But uniformity is not in the spirit of our constitution. We have diversity of franchise as we have diversity of government. There can be no doubt, I suppose, and every one will agree to this view, that the best franchise that could be adopted, the most rational and the most logical, would be one based upon taxation, would be one to make every taxpayer a voter. But such a franchise has never been adopted, and will never be adopted. It would lead to consequences which would defeat the object of the franchise. If we were to follow it to its legitimate consequences we would have to give the right of voting to women, married and unmarried, to minors and all

other persons who would otherwise be deprived of their civil rights. In fact,

NO FRANCHISE WAS EVER ADOPTED

on a mere abstract principle. The franchise has been adopted everywhere according to the circumstances of the community where it was applied, according to the wealth, or intelligence, or passions, or prejudices of the community. This bill is an instance of it. You take the bill before the House and it is impossible to find any principle upon which the franchise has been distributed ; there is none. I do not blame the bill for it ; I believe it would not be possible to be otherwise The right honorable gentleman in framing the bill has given the franchise to unmarried women.and not to married women. He has given the franchise to farmers' sons and not to the sons of artisans. He has given the franchise to men who are owners of real estate in rural parts to the value of one hundred and fifty dollars, and refused it to those who are owners of real estate to the value of only $100.00. In cities, he gives it to owners only to the extent of $300.00. What is the reason of all these differences ; what is the principle which underlies this bill ? There is none. The honorable gentleman has framed a franchise which he thought best adapted to the circumstances of the community. This would be well and right, and there would be no fault to find with the bill, if this was a single community But this is the point, and it is the objection to this bill ; we have not a single community in this country. We have seven different communities, and what the honorable member for North-Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said, yesterday, that we have seven independent commonwealths in this country is a truth which cannot be denied. This is the mistake in this bill ; it treats this country as a single community, and in the plan we find the well known predilection of the right honorable gentleman

in favor of a legislative union. He does not admit that it is right to have seven separate communities. His opinion is that it would be right to have but one community, and acting on that view he has devised the franchise which is best adapted to suit the conveniences of a single community. Well, I start on this principle, and it is one which I commend especially to my colleagues from the province of Quebec, which is supposed to be more in favor of the federative principle than the other provinces; that we have in this country

SEVEN DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES.

This is a fact which exists in the face of the law.

It may be wise or unwise, according to the preferences and predilections of every one, but this is the basis of our constitution. Our constitution is based upon diversity—diversity is the basis of our constitution. If we had uniformity of territory, of population, of institutions, perhaps we would have had a uniform franchise. But our constitution recognizes the differences of population and of territory, and, as a consequence, I claim, we should also recognize those differences when we prepare a franchise for the whole Dominion. If it be true that this Dominion is composed of seven different communities, it must follow as a logical consequence that the right to determine the franchise is to be left to each separate community. That seems to follow as a logical consequence. What will suit one community will not suit another community. What will suit Prince Edward Island, for instance, will not suit Quebec. In Prince Edward Island they have had universal suffrage for a long time, and, as was gracefully remarked by the member for Ottawa county (Mr Wright), this franchise has worked well. I believe the members from the province of Quebec will admit that universal suffrage would not be suitable to the majority of the people of our province. Then why not leave the regulation of the

franchise to the province of Quebec, if they prefer a franchise of their own; and why not leave it to the province of Prince Edward Island, if they prefer a franchise of their own? The people of Quebec would deem it tyranny if this House were to attempt to impose on them universal suffrage, and the people of Prince Edward Island would deem it tyranny also if you attempt, as is going to be attempted, to restrict their franchise. This is the reason why this matter had better be left

IN THE HANDS OF THE LOCAL LEGISLATURES.

The member for St John (Mr. Weldon) said yesterday that the regulation of the franchise was a matter which properly came within the attributes of civil rights, and therefore had better be left in the hands of the provinces.

I do not contend that we have not the right, constitutionally, to establish a franchise of our own to apply to the whole Dominion; but I say that, according to the spirit of our constitution, the regulation of the franchise is a matter of civil rights which comes properly within the attributes of the local legislatures. What I say now is supported by a very high authority, indeed. Story, in speaking of the regulation of the franchise, uses this significant language:

> The truth seems to be that the right of voting, like many other rights, is one which, whether it has a fixed foundation in natural law or not, has always been treated in the practice of nations, as a stricly civil right, derived from and regulated by each society, according to it own circumstances and interests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a high authority—that perhaps is the best commentator we have upon federative institutions; and can it be properly said that on the contrary the regulation of the franchise is to be in the Federal Government, that it is to be given to the whole Dominion and not to the provinces, or local power? I claim under this authority that the regula-

tion of the franchise properly comes within the limits and functions of the local powers. Now what is the reason given in favor of a Dominion franchise? It is that

OUR PROVINCIAL FRANCHISE LACKS UNIFORMITY.

Well I admire the square symmetry of the rectangular lines, but it is not an argument unless it is supported by other reasons. The honorable gentleman attempted to support it—not by reasoning, but by precept, by example and precedent. He says our constitution was derived from the British constitution, and he appealed to British institutions as a reason for our having a uniform franchise. Well, the example is certainly poorly adapted to that purpose, for even in Great Britain, where they have legislative union, uniformity of franchise is not known—in fact, the franchise is much more diversified than our own. Let me quote on this point, from a well known book—one which is in the hands of everybody, the Statesman's Year Book. Speaking of the franchise and its modifications, the author speaks thus:

The next great change in the constituency of the House of Commons, after the act of 1832, was made by the Reform Bill of 1867-68. By this Act England and Wales were allotted 493 members and Scotland 60, while the number of Ireland, remained unaltered. In a borough a man was entitled to vote who was of full age, legally competent, had been an occupier of a house as owner or tenant for 12 months previous to July 20th of any year, and had paid his rates; a lodger was entitled to vote who had occupied the same lodgings for a year, if these lodgings, unfurnished, were of the value of at least £10 a year, paid by him. Every freeholder and leaseholder of the annual value of 40 shilings, every copyholder and leaseholder of the annual value of £5, every householder whose rent was not less than £12, and every tenant whose rent was £50 a year, was entitled to vote for a county representative. In Scotland the ownership franchise for the county was £5; householders who had paid their rates and lodgers who paid £10, copyholders or leaseholders having a 60 years' lease, the value of whose copyhold

or leasehold exceeded by at least £10 the rent or charge upon it, had a vote for the county. Leaseholders having a 20 years' lease of a clear value of £20 had also a county vote. The borough franchise in Ireland was confined to householders rated at not less than £4 a year.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that Great Britain not only has established a separate franchise for each of the three Kingdoms, but in each

THERE ARE SEVERAL CLASSES

or standards of franchise. But our constitution is not only derived from British institutions; it is mainly derived from the American constitution, and the American constitution has a principle exactly similar to that which I now advocate. They have not a uniform franchise; they have a State franchise, and the constitution enacts that the electors to the House of Representatives shall have the qualifications requisite for elections to the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. Now the American constitution is our model in that respect. That constitution has stood the test of a great civil war. It has been amended from time to time, but very sparingly, and there has not been, to my knowledge, any complaint made against this provision of the constitution. Yesterday the honorable member for King's (Mr. Foster), speaking on this question, said it was the duty of this House to regulate its own franchise, and not to leave it to the whim or fancy of this one or that one, but that we should enact who should be the electors to this House. Well, for my part, I have no objection that this should be done; perhaps it is well after all that the question should be settled once and for all, and that to-day this House should determine who should be electors to this House. But if that is to be done, let it be done

AS IT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE UNITED STATES.

as it has been in the Dominion since the Confederation, and let us determine that the electors to the House of Commons shall be the electors to the several Local Legislatures. Now, again, the honorable gentleman, addressing himself to this question, said we should be independent of the Local Legislatures. Well, we are independent of the Local Legislatures in our own sphere, just as much as the Local Legislatures are independent of us in their sphere. But, at the same time, this House has no rights at all of its own; the only rights which it enjoys are those which are delegated to it by the people of the provinces and it is not for this House to determine what people of the provinces shall delegate these powers to the House or in what manner they shall be constituted for that purpose; it is the people themselves who should determine who shall be the constituents of the members of this House, according to the mode regulated by the constitution, speaking through the Local Legislatures. Again, the honorable Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) speaking to this question, said we should have a legislative franchise of our own, independent of the franchise of our Local Legislatures. He said in so many words: Let the Local Legislatures have their own franchise if they choose, but let us go on and establish our franchise. This would be well enough if we had two classes of electors, one class for the Dominion House and one class for the Local Legislatures. But the honorable gentleman forgets that it is the same people who are represented in the Local Legislatures and the Dominion House. Our system of government is a system of divided powers. It is the same people who are represented in either House, whether in the Local Legislatures or the House of Commons. This House has certain powers delegated to it by the people. The Local Legislatures have certain powers delegated to them by the people,

BUT IT IS THE SAME PEOPLE

who delegate those powers in each instance. It is to my mind a fact which cannot be denied that this bill is an attempt at the federal principle. It is an attempt at centralization. No one ever dreamed that the right honorable gentleman who proposed the bill on this occasion and on former occasions would show his hand and declare in so many words that his object in proposing this measure was centralization. In 1870, when the measure was discussed for the first time, the honorable gentleman's most trusted lieutenant, Sir Charles Tupper, used this significant language:

> He entirely agreed with the centralizing principle of the bill, and he also thought that the franchise should be as near as possible uniform.

I commend this language, Sir, to those who value the federative principle. They will find it to be the true keynote of this measure; in fact, as the first lieutenant of the First Minister said, this was no less than a measure of centralization and that was the reason he supported it. Now, in order to show that the franchise is specially a local matter and not a matter of Dominion concern, let us look at the bill itself. The bill, it is said, aims at uniformity, but it does not provide for uniformity. There are two different standards of franchise in this bill, one for cities and towns, and one for rural constituencies. A man, if he has property or real estate to the extent of $150, if that property is situated in a rural constituency, is a voter, but if the same real estate forms part of a city he is not a voter. Now, why is this? I am not going to enquire as to the reason for it; but this shows that if there can be in the same province two different standards for the franchise, still more there ought to be

DIFFERENT STANDARDS IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES.

As to the question of woman franchise there seems to be a great diversity of opinion in this House. For my part, I say if Ontario wants to have a woman franchise, let them have it. Let the legislature of Ontario give it to women if the people of Ontario say that it is best for themselves. If Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or any other province wants to give the right of suffrage to women, let it do so; their legislatures have the power to do it; but in the province of Quebec, so far as I know, there is not one single class in the community that would extend the right of the franchise to women, not even to that fair portion of them to whom it is intended to give it by this bill. I must say this further: I am really surprised to see the Minister of Public Works, who has always been represented among us as the uncompromising champion of that old, pure, unpolluted Conservatism which would not yield to the abominations of modern doctrines, promoting in this House a bill which is not only a concession to the wickedness of modern doctrines, but which is far in advance of all accepted modern doctrines, even in the most advanced countries. If this bill becomes law, it will go forth to the world that we in Canada are more advanced than most of the States of the American union; more advanced than Republican France; more advanced than Italy; and all this will be due to a Conservative Government of which the Minister of Public Works is a member. Now, I commend the Minister of Public Works to the tender mercies of the good, pious, Conservative French of the province of Quebec. I am sure of one thing; if such a measure had come from this side of the House, there would have been thousands of appeals against it, as to the wickedness of the Rouges; but

IT IS A CONSERVATIVE MEASURE,

and, being a Conservative measure, I suppose it must

be accepted by the Conservative party. The right honorable leader of the Government said that he was in favor of the emancipation of women. I am of French origin, and I am a Liberal ; and holding this double title, I claim that I am in favor of the emancipation of the women as much as he can be ; but I do not believe that the emancipation of women can be promoted so much by political as by social reform. I believe that the action of women must be most influential in politics as in everything else, but I believe that action is more effective if exercised in the circle of home, by persuasion and advice, than if woman is brought to the poll to vote. If the right honorable gentleman is really anxious to do something for the emancipation of woman, let him give her the opportunity for more extensive education, let him open for her more fields of employment, and he will do more for her emancipation than by giving her the right to vote. But there is a greater objection to the proposal of the right honorable gentlemen in this regard, an objection which was pointed out yesterday by the honorable member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright). This measure proposes to give the right of suffrage to unmarried ladies only, and it is a premium on celibacy. The right honorable gentleman said it was a measure of emancipation. If it be a boon, therefore, he places unmarried ladies in this dilemma : they have either to choose to remain single and have the right to vote or to marry and lose the right to vote. It is not fair that it should be so. The writers of the past have spoken of the perplexities of a young woman placed between two suitors ; but the writers of the future will have to show the perplexity of the young woman who has to choose between a husband and the right to vote. It is not fair that it should be so, and if this measure is pressed it will be a novel method of promoting the emancipation of women. But the measure is liable to graver and greater objections. I submit to the sense of the House that this measure is

AN INVASION OF POPULAR RIGHTS.

Hitherto the voters' lists have been prepared by the people themselves. The assessment rolls have been prepared by the people themselves through valuators appointed by the municipal councils. The lists have been prepared by the people themselves through secretary-treasurers appointed by the municipal councils; the lists have been revised by the people themselves through the municipal councils. This system, so far as I know, has worked satisfactorily and well. Now it is proposed that there shall be a change. What reason is given for that change? Why should this right be taken from the people? If I had to make a report upon my countrymen I would say this, that they are too apathetic in the discharge of their public duties—that they do not give to public business all the attention they ought to give. The present system forces them to give their attention to public business. Now, that system is to be changed. The voters' lists are henceforth to be prepared, not by the people, but by lawyers appointed by the Government, assisted by clerks and constables. What can be the reason of that change? Can it be for the sake of uniformity? Uniformity is not alleged in this instance. Is it because of the adoption of a Dominion franchise, and because since we have a Dominion franchise we cannot allow the lists to be prepared by the municipal councils, but must have them prepared by officials of our own? But, as long as we give the execution of our laws to the courts of justice, I do not see why we should not give the the administration of that part of the law to the municipal councils. If the change is made as a consequence of the introduction of a Dominion franchise, this must be

A BAD MEASURE, INDEED,

if to carry it out you are obliged to deprive the people of a portion of the rights they now exercise. The

present system has so far worked satisfactorily ; I am not aware that the voters' lists have not been properly prepared and revised by those who have hitherto had the duty of preparing and revising them. Under the law, —in the province of Quebec, at all events,—there is an appeal from the decision of the municipal councils to the courts ; I have been curious to know if this right of appeal has been exercised to any degree. Because if it had been exercised to a great degree, that would be an evidence that the law was not properly administered by the province ; but if I find that the appeals have been very few indeed, the only conclusion I can arrive at is that it works well. A friend of mine has taken the trouble to enquire how many appeals have been taken in the several districts in the four years, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884 ; and as a result of that enquiry I find that in the district of Montreal there have been 16, in Quebec none, in Three Rivers 10, in St Francis none, in Arthabaska 2, in Montmagny 4, in Terrebonne none, in Rimouski none, in Richelieu none, in Beauce none, in Ottawa none, in Gaspé none, in Joliette 1, and Bedford 1 ; in all only 40 appeals in the four years, or ten per year. Well, in the province of Quebec there are something like 800 municipalities, so that the number is just a little more than one per cent. and less than two per cent. of the total number of lists prepared each year in all the municipalities. It is therefore evident that

THIS SYSTEM HAS WORKED SATISFACTORILY

and you must remember this, that the appeal given under the present law is not an appeal of grace such as provided for in this bill, but an appeal which is in the right of every one, and yet there has been, under this system, only an average of a little more than one per cent. of complaints made to the superior tribunals of the regulation of the franchise as established by the municipal councils. The bill is still liable to a graver objection ; it is a direct invasion of the

powers hitherto enjoyed by the people. So far the people themselves have had the preparation of these lists, but henceforward that power is to be taken out of their hands; and what is the reason given for taking away from the people that duty of which they have had the enjoyment ever since Confederation? I use the word enjoyment advisedly, because the exercise of a duty so precious as this must be an enjoyment rather than an obligation. Yet this precious right is proposed to be taken away from the people; and I do not imagine that the sturdy yeomen of this country will submit to this for any length of time; I do not imagine that they will yield without a protest this right

TO HENCHMEN OF THE GOVERNMENT,

to the innumerable army of parasites which feed on the Government and whose sole object will be to do the bidding of the Government. In every conceivable point this measure is in my opinion a bad measure, one that will be denounced by all those who believe in popular rights, who believe in the sacredness of our constitution, as an invasion of popular rights, and as a step towards centralization; and in this view I beg to move the following resolution :—

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following inserted: In the opinion of this House it is preferable to continue the plan which has been adopted ever since Confederation of utilizing for the election of this House the provincial franchise and voters' lists.

The Second Insurrection in the North-West

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHARGED WITH HAVING DELIBERATELY PROVOKED IT

MR. LAURIER'S INDICTMENT

The following speech by Mr. Laurier created an immense sensation in Parliament, delivered as it was under very solemn circumstances at the time when the Federal volunteers were returning from a campaign of several months in the North West, which had cost the country both blood and millions of money. On the evening previous (6th July, 1885) Honorable Edward Blake had, in four brief lines, formulated a most formidable indictment against the Government, openly and boldly accusing them of having been the real provokers and authors of the insurrection. In support of his motion, which was in these terms:

To leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following instead thereof: It be *Resolved*,—That in the administration of North-West affairs by the present Government, prior to the recent outbreak, there have occured grave instances of neglect, delay and mismanagement in matters affecting the peace, welfare and good government of the country.

Mr. Blake had made a long and eloquent speech, which was answered by Sir John A Macdonald, who in turn was replied to by Mr. Laurier:

—[Taken from the Hansard of 1885, p. 319, sitting of 7th July]

MR. SPEAKER,

There is an old saying well known to all of us that a good lawyer can make of a bad cause a good one. The speech of the right honorable gentleman yesterday must have convinced everyone of us that there are cases so desperately bad that all the ingenuity of the ablest counsel cannot make them appear good. The case must be desperate, indeed, when a gentleman of the high position which the right honorable gentleman occupies in this House, does not scruple to torture the words of his opponent, in order to make out a case for himself. In the very beginning of his speech, the honorable gentleman adopted that system, and he kept it up to the end. In almost his opening sentence the right honorable gentleman stated that my honorable friend, the leader of the Opposition —in the long, as he characterized it, and as he might have said, the most able speech ever delivered by my honorable friend—while presenting the claims of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories to a special grant of land, had not in a single instance stated that the claim was a just one. The honorable gentleman forgot, and he should not have forgotten, that my honorable friend at the very outset of his speech affirmed the justice of the case of the half-breeds in the most characteristic manner, in the following language:

> Justice is the same everywhere. Justice is the same, whether it be on the banks of the Saskatchewan or on the banks of the Red River; justice demands that the same treatment which has been extended to the half-breeds on the banks of the Red River shall also be extended to the half-breeds on the banks of the Saskatchewan.

The right honorable gentleman, Sir, forgot that statement, and the case has to be a desperate one, indeed, when it has to be supported with such a distortion of facts. Again, the honorable gentleman, proceeding in the same line, in order to clear himself of

the charge that was brought against him of having failed for seven years to dispose of the claims of the half-breeds, stated that the Mackenzie Administration had not only failed to dispose of those claims, but had actually denied their justice; and in order to prove his statement he proceeded to quote with great apparent glee from a State paper of my honorable friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) while in the Mackenzie Government. That paper was addressed to Mr. Laird, at that time Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories, in answer to an application made by him for seed grain on behalf of the half-breeds. The honorable member for Bothwell wrote as follows :—

> The application of the petitioners to be aided by the Government with seed and agricultural implements in their farming operations, I confess I am not disposed to view favorably. I do not see upon what grounds the half-breeds can claim to be treated in this particular different from the white settlers in the Territories.
>
> The half-breeds, who have, in some respects, the advantages over new settlers in the Territories, should be impressed with the necessity of settling down in fixed localities and directing their energies towards pastoral or agricultural pursuits, in which case lands would, no doubt, be assigned to them in the same way as to white settlers. But beyond this they must not look to the Government for any special assistance in their farming operations.

So that this paper of my honorable friend from Bothwell did not at all apply to the question of the lands and the extinguishment of the Indian title, but it applied to the treatment of the half-breeds and their claim to be aided by being furnished seed and agricultural implements. That was all, and yet, during the whole of the speech of the right honorable gentleman, he insisted that the Mackenzie Government had denied the claims of the half-breeds to a special grant of land in extinguishment of the Indian title. Then again, continuing in the same strain, the right honorable gentleman charged his predecessors with dereliction of duty, because they had failed, while in power,

to settle the land claims of the half-breeds. Sir, is it possible that the right honorable gentleman had the courage to advance such a plea as this in justification of himself? How long is it since the Mackenzie Administration has fallen from power? It is six full years; nearly seven years have elapsed since then. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it was a crime in the Mackenzie Administration to have failed to settle those claims, how can the honorable gentleman defend himself when he has allowed nearly seven years to elapse without doing so either? The charge against the Mackenzie Administration is perfectly groundless, as I shall demonstrate before I take my seat, but if that pretended excuse be the only justification which the right honorable gentleman can urge in his behalf, I leave it to the judgment of this country to say whether it is a sufficient justification or not. Now, the honorable gentleman proceeded very exultingly to declare that there had been no case of oppression, that there was not even a pretension that the people had been oppressed, that not a single half-breed had been removed from his holding. No cause for oppression! Why, Mr. Speaker, was it not oppression when men had long been settled upon their lands, even before the country was transferred to Canada, when they had made homes for themselves, when they had put buildings upon their lands, and when, under the policy of the present Government, land surveyors were sent among them, who ran lines across their fields, splitting up farms and fields, who ran their lines so as to put the buildings on one side and the fields on the other; and after these people had sent delegation after delegation to this Government for redress, had been constantly refused redress. If this was not a case of oppression, I would like to know what can constitute oppression in the eyes of the right honorable gentleman? The homes of these people were invaded—not accidentally, but deliberately—under the policy of the Government for the survey of that country; and yet the honorable gentleman says

there was no case of oppression. Sir, what was it then that Father André protested against when he wrote to the Government in the following manner, first setting forth that settlers there have settled according to the old custom, ten chains fronting on the river, and trusting the Government would survey accordingly, he adds:

Their surprise may be imagined when they saw the lands along the Saskatchewan measured off into squares of forty chains, without heed being given to their just claims and protests.

What is that Father Vigreville protested against when he wrote to Captain Deville, chief of the surveys?

I, myself, caused Mr. Duck, the Dominion land surveyor, to write several times to Ottawa and always without success, until finally I became discouraged myself, and several people were obliged to leave the settlement, some selling their land for a nominal price and others abandoning it without any compensation.

In February, 1883, the Rev. Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney were deputed by the settlement to set forth our complaints and present our demand to the Government. They were given a written promise that the lands we occupied should be surveyed in river lots of 10 chains the autumn following (1883). I understand you to tell me to have patience; that everything will come out right in the end. These are words which, permit me to say, I cannot accept: the time is past.

The honorable gentleman then proceeded to say that no half-breed had ever been molested, that no half-breed had ever lost his holding. In an organ of the Government, *Le Manitoba* of 13th May last, I find the following letter from half-breeds, which was first published in English in the Edmonton *Bulletin*. I have it here in French, and I will re-translate it into the original English. This is what the paper goes on to say:

Far from obtaining liberal terms, we have not even ob-

tained justice. Last summer we had the agent of the Government to settle all questions relating to lands in this locality. If the agent's only object had been to provoke the half-breed rebellion he could not have done better than by following the course he has done, and giving the decisions he has recorded, which decisions are always characterized by the most manifest injustice. It would be impossible to state a case of a section of land in dispute between a half-breed and a stranger where the half-breed has not been sacrificed. In many instances half-breeds, who for a long time have been in possession of these lands, have had their lands taken away from them and divided among strangers newly arrived; and these unfortunate half-breeds have been thereby forced to leave the place and go and settle elsewhere where the same fate perhaps awaits them in the future. Is it believed we have no grievance? We have grievances and we feel them deeply.

Signed, SAMUEL CUNNINGHAM.
OCTAVE BELLEROSE,
JOHN CUNNINGHAM.
BAPTISTE COURTEPATTE,
JOHN ROWLAND,
O. ROWLAND,
L. CHASTELLAIRE.
L. GORIVEAU.

Then the honorable gentleman proceeded to say that the whole blame for the rebellion and its consequences must be cast upon the Grit party. When the honorable gentleman has made such a statement as I have just referred to, that there are no grievances among the half-breeds in the North-West, he may as well say that the Grit party is responsible for the rebellion and all its consequence. Such rant—for such language is nothing more than rant— is unworthy of him. Yet, such language is quite in keeping with the language which the honorable gentlemen has used ever since the opening of these troubles. Ever since these North-West troubles arose, the tactics of the honorable gentlemen have been

TO WASH THEIR HANDS

of all responsibility and proclaim themselves quite

innocent of the bloodshed, and lay all the blame on the insurgents. To every enquiry made as to the origin of these troubles, the same answer is given: The half-breeds have no cause, they have no grievances. Such has been the language of the honorable gentlemen all through. Speaking on a recent occasion on the same subject, he stated, what he repeated again yesterday, that the half-breeds had no cause, that the rebellion was a causeless rebellion; and he concluded in the following language:

> We believe, with all the consciousness of being right, that the judgment of the country will be that we have acted well, that we have acted to the best of our abilities and that, in this case, our abilities have not been wrongly directed.

And again, speaking on the same subject on another occasion, he made another declaration. At that time he believed that the rebellion was not due to the Grit party—that is a new thought, a new grievance—but was due to Louis Riel. He said:

> From former occurrences in the North-West, he (Riel) is considered a sort of martyr in the cause—a sort of half-breed Mahdi—and they look up to him with a sort of superstitious regard, and from that feeling he is able to act upon these poor people.

Such was the language of the honorable gentleman. The only explanation he could give of the rebellion has been this: That the insurgents had no grievances, but that they had been the the victims and dupes of Louis Riel. Such an explanation is exceedingly futile. From what we know of Louis Riel, he does not appear to be one of those extraordinary men, who can command general sway over their fellow countrymen. And there is no man in the world, whatever his power may be, who could take men from a state of peace and bring them into war,

SIMPLY BY HIS INFLUENCE,

unless there were deep-seated and long-felt feelings of grievances. The honorable gentleman compared Louis Riel to the Mahdi. We know little about the Mahdi. But we do know this: That the people of the Soudan who were brought into rebellion had been suffering for years and years from most despotic rule. They had been for years ground by excessive taxation, and the Mahdi brought them into rebellion by promising to relieve them from the state of suffering in which they were then placed. I can illustrate what I am now saying, that no man however powerful, can exercise such influence as is attributed to Louis Riel, by a page from our own history. Few men have there been anywhere who have wielded greater sway over their fellow-countrymen than did Mr. Papineau at a certain time in the history of Lower-Canada, and no man ever lived who had been more profusely endowed by nature to be the idol of a nation. A man of commanding presence, of majestic countenance, of impassioned eloquence, of umblemished character, of pure, disinterested patriotism, for years and years he held over the hearts of his fellow-countrymen almost unbounded sway, and, even to this day, the mention of his name will arouse throughout the length and breadth of Lower-Canada a thrill of enthusiasm in the breasts of all, men or women, old or young. What was the secret of that great power he held at one time? Was is simply his eloquence, his commanding intellect, or even his pure patriotism? No doubt, they all contributed; but the main cause of his authority over his fellow-countrymen was this, that, at that time, his fellow-countrymen were an oppressed race, and he was the champion of their cause. But when the day of relief came, the influence of Mr. Papineau, however great it might have been and however great it still remained, ceased to be paramount. When eventually the Union Act was carried, Papineau violently assaulted it, showed all its defects, deficiencies

and dangers, and yet he could not raise his followers and the people to agitate for the repeal of that Act.

WHAT WAS THE REASON?

The conditions were no more the same. Imperfect as was the Union Act it still gave a measure of freedom and justice to the people, and men who at the mere sound of Mr. Papineau's voice would have gladly courted death on battle field or scaffold, then stood silent and irresponsive, though he asked them nothing more than a constitutional agitation for a repeal of the Union Act. Conditions were no more the same; tyranny and oppression had made rebels of the people of Lower-Canada, while justice and freedom made them true and loyal subjects, which they have been ever since. And now to tell us that Louis Riel, simply by his influence, could bring these men from peace to war; to tell us that they had no grievances; to tell us that they were brought into a state of rebellion either through pure malice or through imbecile adherence to an adventurer, is an insult to the intelligence of the people at large and an unjust aspersion on the people of the Saskatchewan. The honorable gentleman tells us that the people of the Saskatchewan river have no wrongs; this is but a continuation of the system which has been followed all along with regard to this people. They have been denied their just rights, and now they are slandered by the same men whose unjust course towards them drove them to the unfortunate proceedings they have adopted since. This I do charge upon the Government: that they have for years and years ignored the just claims of the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan, that for years and years these people have been petitioning the Government and always in vain. I say they have been treated by this Government with an indifference amounting to undisguised contempt, that they have been goaded into the unfortunate course they have adopted, and if this rebellion be a crime, I say

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THAT CRIME

weighs as much upon the men who, by their conduct, have caused the rebellion, as upon those who engaged in it. The right honorable gentleman said yesterday that the leader of the Opposition had prepared a brief for the lawyers of Louis Riel.

Some honorable members:— Hear, hear; that is true.

Mr. Laurier:—They say now it is true. I say this, that if the conduct of the Government is part of the defence of Louis Riel, then the Government must take the consequences. It will not do for them to say: You must not attack us, because by attacking us you will save Louis Riel. The Government have put Louis Riel on his trial for life and death, and I suppose it is not his blood they are looking for. I suppose, if they are looking to anything, they are looking to nothing but substantial British justice, and if, in the facts brought out yesterday by my honorable friend, there is something which would go in favor of the defence of Louis Riel, then Louis Riel has the full right to that part of his defence. I say more. I repeat that I do not believe that the men who to-day have put Louis Riel on his trial for his life and death do not desire his blood, that they are only looking for justice; and if justice requires that in the numerous papers which have been suppressed, which have not been brought down to this House, there is anything which can go in favor of Louis Riel's defence, it is their duty to bring them down, and if they were concealing anything which could serve for the defence of Louis Riel, I would charge them with helping his murder, if he were tried in the absence of such portion of his defence. It will not do for the honorable gentleman to attempt to rouse the prejudices of the masses with respect to this matter.

THERE ARE PREJUDICES IN THIS COUNTRY

of many kinds. We are not yet so built up as a nation

as to forget our respective origins, and I say frankly that the people of my own province, who have a community of origin with the insurgents, sympathize with them, just as the sympathies of the people of Ontario who are of a different origin would go altogether in the other direction.

Some honorable members :—No, sir.

Mr. Laurier :—No? Why is it then that it was repeated yesterday, that it is repeated to-day in the press, that it will be asserted and repeated to-morrow, and again that my honorable friend, the leader of the Opposition, has prepared a brief for the lawyers of Louis Riel. Why, Sir, that is appealing to the worst kind and the lowest prejudices of the masses. It is said, and truly said, in your language, Sir, that blood is thicker than water. I am of French origin, and I confess that if I were to act only from the blood which runs in my veins, it would carry me strongly in favor of these people; but, above all, I claim to be in favor of what is just and right and fair, to be in favor of justice to every man, and I say, let justice be done, and let the consequences fall upon the guilty ones, whether on the head of Louis Riel, or on the shoulders of the Government. Sir, the Government are all the more unjustifiable in their conduct, that the experience of the past ought to have made them more cautions. It is an ominous fact that, although this young Confederation has existed only eighteen years, it has already been assailed twice by armed rebellion. Of the first rebellion we now know the causes. Light has been let upon that subject. What was the cause of the first rebellion on the Red River in 1869 and 1870? The cause, as we now know, is that the Government—this Government, the men who are in power now, and who were in power then—attempted to take possession of the country

WITHOUT ANY REGARD

to the rights of the people as a whole, whilst they invaded the rights of the people as individuals. It

may be conceived that these people, who had been accustomed to the wild liberty of the prairie, who had been accustomed for generations and generations to rove all over the whole continent, who looked upon the country as their own, and regarded as their own every plot of land on which they chose to pitch their tents; I say it may be well conceived that these people, half wild as they were, would regard with something like jealousy the doings of a Government which suddenly came in upon them and assumed authority over the territory. Then what took place at that time? One would have thought that it would have been at least prudent on the part of the Government to take some conciliatory steps towards these people, but instead of that they went into the country and treated the people as people used to be treated in feudal times, as if they had been part and parcel of the territory which was purchased from the Hudson's Bay Company—treating the people, I say, as if they were serfs in feudal times—part of the ground which was sold. The people resented such a course. But that was not all. The Government attempted a system of survey which was the most odious that could be devised for the people. Some of the people had holdings or properties, with fields and buildings, and the surveyors sent by the Government paid no heed to their holdings, but ran their lines across their possessions, and, as might be imagined,

A GREAT DISTURBANCE

took place. The facts are well illustrated by the history of the rebellion, and I cannot do better on this subject than quote the following from the report of Mr. Donald A. Smith, who was at that time appointed agent to investigate the matter:

A not inconsiderable number of them remained true to their allegiance during all the trouble through which they have had to pass, and with these will now be found associated many

others whose minds had for a time been poisoned with gross misrepresentations made by designing men, for their own selfish ends. A knowledge of the true state of the case and of the advantages they would derive from a union with Canada, had been carefully kept from them, and they were told to judge of Canadians generally by the acts and bearing of some of the less reflecting immigrants who had denonced them as cumberers of the ground, who must speedily make way for a superior race about to pour in upon them. It is also true that in the unauthorized proceedings of some of the recent Canadian arrivals, some plausible ground had been given for the jealousy and alarm with which the contemplated change of government was regarded by the native population. In various localities these adventurers had been industriously marking off for themselves considerable, and in some cases very extensive and exceptionally valuable tracts of land, thereby impressing the minds of the people with the belief that the time had come when, in their own country, they were to be entirely supplanted by strangers—a belief, however, I have no doubt, which might have been entirely precluded by the prevention of all such operations, until Canada had fully unfolded her policy and shown the groundlessness of these fears.

Upon the same subject, a book written by Mr. Tuttle, "The History of Manitoba," speaks as follows upon the attitude and the feeling of the French half-breeds:

The feeling of the French half-breeds may be briefly expressed as this: That they questioned the right of the Dominion Government to take possession of what they considered their country, without their consent. The feeling was shown in the stoppage of the surveyors, Snow and Webb.

More characteristic yet, a pamphlet, written by Louis Riel, in 1874, and published at the office of the *Nouveau Monde*, reads thus:

The North-West Territorries were transfered to Canada only on the 15th July, 1870; but Canada commenced in 1868-69 public works in its own name, in Rupert's Land and the North-West, without having obtained the authority of the Hudson Bay Company. The arrival of the Canadian agents in the country was signalized by the contempt which they affected for

the authority of the Hudson Bay Company and for the old settlers. They attempted to take possession of the best lands of the half-breeds, especially at Pointe des Chênes, a parish about 30 milles east of Fort Garry. They pretended that they had bought those lands from the Indians. After Mr. Snow had commenced the work of the Dawson route between the Lake of the Woods and Pointe des Chênes, in 1868, in the name of Canada, another intruder, under the same authority, commenced a survey, in the summer of 1869 around Fort Garry, of the public and private lands as well, under a new system of survey which deranged, without explanation at all, the existing order of things, and disturbed without scruple the old settlers in the peaceful and legal possession of their lands.

So, Sir, you see that the grievances of the half-breeds at that time were two-fold. They complained first that Canada had taken possession of their country without respect for their rights as a people; and they complained, in the second place, that the Government, by their system of survey, had invaded their actual possessions and properties. Well, they rebelled; they could not stand this; and the consequence of this rebellion, whatever it may have been otherwise, was that the Government were forced to grant to the half-breeds what they had denied hitherto, that is, the Government acknowledged their right of sovereignty in the land by the distribution of 1,400,000 acres among them, in extinguishment of the Indian title, and abandoned the old system of survey and adopted a new system by which the holdings of the half-breeds were respected. Now, it might have been hoped that the experience of the past would have made the Government more cautious, and would have taught them to treat a highly sensitive people like the half-breeds with something like fairness and consideration. Indeed, the Government seem to be just like the Bourbons, who, according to Napoleon, neither learned nor forgot anything; in this matter the Government seem not to have learned anything or forgotten anything. I say the present Government are far more open to censure for the uprising on the

Saskatchewan River than they were for the uprising on the Red River. Guilty as they were in 1869 for their treatment of the half-breeds on the Red River, this, at least, might be said in attenuation, that they had no time to change their policy—that the rebellion sprang up on them before they had time to retrace their steps and correct the errors which more caution at the outset might have averted. But on this present occasion, if millions of dollars have been expended within a few weeks, if valuable lives have been lost and some of the most precious blood of Canada has been shed, if the horrors of civil war, and worse yet of Indian war, have to be deplored, what is the reason? Is it because the Government have not had time to mend a vicious policy, to retrace their steps? Sir, it is because for years and years the Government have pursued a system which they are even now pursuing, of denying that the people had grievances to complain of. It is because for years and years the Government have closed their ears not to hear the complaints, because they have closed their eyes not to see the wrongs, because they have acted like the ostrich which buries its head in the sand so as not to see the danger, and thus ignores the danger; this is the reason that we have had an uprising on the Saskatchewan; and, as I said, the Government are far more open to censure for this uprising than they were for the uprising of 1869-70. There was no disturbance on the Saskatchewan River in 1869-70, and the reason is obvious; in 1869-70 the Government had not attempted to assert their authority on the banks of the Saskatchewan River; they did not push on their authority at that time beyond the Red River, and therefore the people on the Saskatchewan River, not being interfered with in any way, continued to live as they had lived hitherto. But the day came when the Government of Canada undertook to assert their authority on the Saskatchewan, and properly so, in order to open that fine country to immigration from the east, and the half-breeds on that river showed

the same anxiety and made the same claims as the half-breeds on the Red River had done. I have shown you that the claims of the half-breeds on the Red River were two-fold—they claimed that their rights to the soil should be recognized in some manner and they were recognized; and they asked that they should not be troubled in their holdings, and those claims were conceded to them. As soon as the Canadian Government attempted to assert their authority on the Saskatchewan River, the half-breeds there made exactly the same claims. At the outset they demanded

NOTHING MORE OR LESS

than that their rights to the soil and their rights in the extinguishment of the Indian title should be recognized and that the lands they held they should be allowed to continue to hold without disturbance.

With regard to the first question, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware, though the honorable gentleman said to the contrary yesterday, that the half-breeds of Saskatchewan River ever formulated any demand as to lands before the year 1878, or the last days of 1877. The honorable gentleman said that demands had been made to the Government of my honorable friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I believe that some demands from the Qu'Appelle district were made before 1878, but no demand, so far as I am aware from the banks of the Saskatchewan, came to the Government before 1878; and the reason is obvious. The country had just only been opened for settlement; the Government had not attempted to exercise authority over the territory for more than 3 years; Mr. Laird, who was the first Lieutenant-Governor, was appointed in 1876, and he only reached Battleford in 1877; in fact, it took him several months of travel to get to the seat of government at Battleford. In 1877, a petition was formulated by the half-breeds, and it ran as follows:

Your petitioners would humbly represent that their rights

to a participation in the issue of half-breeds' or old settlers' scrip are as valid and binding as those of the half-breeds and old settlers of Manitoba, and are expected by them to be regarded as scrupulously as in that Province; and with a view to the adjustment of the same your petitioners would humbly reqnest that a census of said half-breeds and old settlers be taken at as early a date as may be conveniently determined upon, with a view to apportioning to those of them, who have not already been included in the census of Manitoba, their just allotments of land and scrip.

Then, some time in the month of February, a deputation came from St. Laurent to interview Mr. Laird about the same matter, and they presented him a petition, making in substance the same demand. This petition was addressed, not to the Government of Ottawa, but to the Lieutenant-Governor himself; he referred it to his council; the council did not sit until the following month of August; and in that month the council adopted the resolution which has been several times quoted yesterday, whereby the claims of the half-breeds for an apportionment of land were presented favorably to the Government at Ottawa. The resolution ran as follows :—

That in view of the fact that grants of land and issues of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands of that province, there will undoubtedly be general dissatisfaction among the half-breeds of the said Territories unless they receive some like consideration.

When Mr. Laird visited Duck Lake settlement in the following month of September, he was again interviewed by a deputation of the St. Laurent settlement, and they asked him particulars as to what had become of their petition, and what treatment it had received at the hands of the Government. Mr. Laird explained that, the council having sat only in August, the Government had not yet had time to consider their application. They were

SATISFIED WITH THE EXPLANATION,

and their spokesman cordially thanked the Lieutenant-Governor for the kind manner in which he had replied to their enquiries. The half-breeds, it must be said, displayed on that occasion a most gentle spirit; they could not have acted with greater propriety. Then came the fall of the Mackenzie Government and a new Government came into power, the Government of the honorable gentleman opposite. In 1879, the Government took power to deal with the half-breeds in the same manner as the former Government took power to deal with the half-breeds of the Red River, and after the manner suggested by the North-West Council; that is to say, the Government took power for the extinguishment of the Indian title, in so far as it was vested in the half-breeds. Before going further, it is appropriate that we should at once, in order to fix the responsibility of the Government in this matter, refer to the whole legislation on this point; the Act of 1870, which was the first Act, the Act of 1874, which was the second Act, and then the Act of 1879, to see exactly what was the purport and the object and the cause of the legislation then put upon the statute book. The Act of 1870 ran as follows:—

And whereas it is expedient, towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the Province, to appropriate a portion of such ungranted lands, to the extent of 1,400,000 acres thereof, for the benefit of the families of the half-breed residents, it is hereby enacted, that, under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor General in Council, the Lieutenant-Governor shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the Province as he may deem expedient to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the said transfer to Canada.

So the object of the Act is perfectly clear; it is an allotment of land to the extent of 1,400,000 acres for the avowed purpose of dividing the same

among the children of the heads of half-breed families, towards the extinguishment of the Indian title. Then, the Act of 1874 ran as follows :--

Whereas, by the 31st section of the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 3, it was enacted as expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the Province of Manitoba, to appropriate one million four hundred thousand acres of such lands, for the benefit of the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the transfer thereof to Canada; and whereas no provision has been made for extinguishing the Indian title to such lands as respects the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the period named; and whereas it is expedient to make such provision, and it is deemed advisable to effect the same by grant of land or by an issue of scrip redeemable in Dominion lands.

Here, again, the same spirit is apparent, the same object is avowed. The grant is made in extinguishment of the Indian title, in so far as it was vested in the half-breeds; and in 1879 the Act passed by honorable gentlemen opposite upon this question enacted as follows:—

The Government have power to satisfy any claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title, preferred by half-breeds resident in the North-West Territories outside of the limits of Manitoba, on the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, by granting land to such persons, to such extent and on such terms and conditions, as may be deemed expedient.

So there cannot be any ambiguity. Provision was introduced in the last statute by honorable gentlemen opposite themselves with the express object of extinguishing the Indian title vested in the half-breeds. This Act

NEVER WAS PUT IN FORCE,

its provisions never were carried out. What was the reason? We do not know yet. The Government never

simply because the Prime Minister held that the half-breeds

WERE NOT ENTITLED

to a special grant of land, and this I can prove out of his own mouth. Not later than the 26th March, the Prime Minister, speaking upon this very question, expressed himself as follows:—

> As a whole, the half-breeds have been told that if they desire to be considered as Indians, there are most liberal reserves that they could go to with the others; but that if they desired to be considered white men, they could get 160 acres of lands as homesteads. But they are not satisfied with that; they want to get land scrip of equal quantity—I think upwards of 200 acres—and then get, as a matter of course, their homesteads as well.

Sir, this was the policy to which the honorable gentleman objected, that the half-breeds should get their grant of lands in extinguishment of the Indian title, and then be at liberty to settle on the lands in the North-West. That principle, to which the honorable gentleman objected, is the very principle which has been admitted in our statute books ever since 1870. According to the Act of 1870, and the Act of 1874, which completed it, an allotment of land was made to the half-breeds simply in extinguishment of the Indian title, and the half-breed, after he had received the scrip for his land in extinguishment of the Indian title, was at liberty, as every other subject, and even as every foreigner, to go to the North-West and homestead upon any land, and claim it as his own. But the honorable gentleman would not give that to the half-breed. In fact, he said, as late as the 26th of March last, that the half-breeds were asking to have 160 acres of land, the same as every homesteader and besides that 200 acres for the extinguishment of their Indian title, and to this he objected; and this then, Sir, is the reason why, from 1878 to 1885, the

half-breed question has not been dealt with by the honorable gentleman. I say

THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT,

as indicated in the statute book, has been that the half-breeds were entitled, just as much as the Indians, to the extinguishment of the Indian title, but as white men, instead of taking compensation for their Indian title collectively, they were allowed to take it individually, and that is the only difference between them and the Indians, so far as the extinguishment of the Indian title was concerned. And, is land such a scarce article in the North-West? Have we not an abundance of land in the North-West? And will we seriously be told that it was not just or fair that the half-breeds should be allotted a lot of the wide lands of the North-West while the same privileges had been granted to the half-breeds in Manitoba? What reason could there be for not giving to the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan the very same privileges and rights which had been given to the half-breeds on the Red River? As my honorable friend said yesterday, is not justice the same everywhere—upon the Saskatchewan as upon the Red River? If the half-breeds on the Red River were given a special grant of land in extinguishment of the Indian title, did not justice demand that the same privileges and rights should be given to the half-breeds upon the Saskatchewan River? The officers of the Government in the North-West Territories, the North-West Council, the settlers themselves, were more generous to the half-breeds than the right honorable gentleman. Again and again the people of the North-West called the attention of the Government to this. I have already quoted the resolution of the council passed in 1879 upon that question. Again, in 1881, Mr. Clarke, a member of the council, presented a resolution :—

That the half-breeds have always been recognized as possessing rights in the same soil, subject to which the Dominion

the matter, sent a conclusive answer, setting forth all the legislation from 1874 to 1879, and showing conclusively that the policy of this Government had been the extinguishment of the Indian titles in favor of the half-breeds. Then resolutions were also passed by the people in favor of the same policy, but all without avail. At last Riel was sent for and brought into the country, and it would seem that then at least the Government would have yielded what they had so far refused,

BUT STILL THEY MOVED NOT.

And when did they move? At the time, as was shown by my honorable friend yesterday, when the rebellion was ripe in the North-West Territories on the 26th January, they did something; and what was it? They simply asked for a census. At that time they had no policy upon the matter. When they issued the Order in Council on the 26th January, 1885, to take a census of the half-breeds in the North-West, at that time they had no policy, because, as I have shown by the language of the right honorable gentleman, on the 26th March following, he would not acknowledge that the half-breeds were entitled to a special grant in extinguishment of the Indian title. He simply pretended that they had no more rights than the ordinary settlers; that all they could do was simply to go on to the lands unsettled and take up a homestead or preemption, and nothing more; so that at that very time, on the 26th March, the Government had no policy whatever. But, Sir, something took place then which gave the Government a policy, and what was it? Sir, on the very day the honorable gentleman was speaking here in this House, when he stated that the half-breeds of the North-West had no more rights than the ordinary settler, that all they could ask for was a homestead or preemption, on that very day the fight at Duck Lake was going on; and the bullets of the Duck Lake fight did more to

settle this question than six long years of prayers and petitions had done. Six long years of constant petitioning had failed to secure justice for these people, had failed to procure a remedy of the grievances of which they complained, but

THE BULLETS OF DUCK LAKE

immediately set the Government in motion and immediately brought them to terms. On the 30th March, four days afterwards, the Government came down with an Order in Council in which, for the first time, the rights of the half-breeds were to some extent acknowledged. Not completely acknowledged, however; by this Order in Council the half-breeds were allowed a certain grant of land, not, however, in extinguishment of the Indian title, but with conditions of settlement. Then commissioners were appointed and proceeded to the disturbed districts. One of the commissioners, Mr. Street, being on the spot, looking at the matter, advised the Government that it was necessary in order to satisfy these people to give them a special grant of land, the same as had been given to the half-breeds in Manitoba, irrespective of conditions of settlement; and since that time, forsooth, the commissioners have been distributing scrip amongst the half breeds in North-West Territory. At last Mr. Speaker, these men who have been petitioning for that special grant ever since 1878 and who up to March, 1885, could not obtain it—at last they succeeded in their request. Still, Sir, justice is doubly just and doubly precious when it is freely and gently given, but justice loses most of its value when it is tardily and grudgingly conceded as it was on this occasion. Even last night the honorable gentleman would not say that, in so doing, the Government were doing justice to the half-breeds of Manitoba; he would not say that he recognized their rights; he simply said that he would do it, and did it for the sake of peace. For the sake of peace, when we were

in the midst of war; for the sake of peace. when insurgents were in the field, and when blood had been shed! Does the honorable gentleman suppose that this tardy concession will conciliate the feelings of the half-breeds? No, Sir; the feeling that will remain in their hearts will be that they were denied their rights while they confined themselves to petitioning for them, but as soon as they took up

THEIR OLD RUSTY MUSKETS

they brought the Government to their knees and secured what constitutional means could not obtain. This is the feeling which will remain in the hearts of the half-breeds. It is the same with regard to the unenumerated claims in Manitoba. There were a certain number of half-breeds who had not been enumerated in Manitoba, who had also a right to a special grant of land. They petitioned the Government; the North-West Council also petitioned the Government, the friends of the Government in the North-West petitioned, and all without avail. But on the 9th April, after the rebellion had been raging for some time, the Government again came to their knees and granted to threats and violence what had been refused to petitions and prayers. In fact, the Government have not even the courage of Falstaff, for, if I remember rightly, Falstaff said that: "Were reasons as plentiful as berries, I would not give a reason upon compulsion." But the Government would not give anything except upon compulsion. They resisted the prayers and petitions of the settlers, but when the settlers came with arms in their hands, the Government immediately yielded and granted their requests. Sir, there was, as I said before, another claim which was made by the half-breeds—it was that they should not be disturbed in their holdings. It was that they were to be allowed to occupy their holdings such as they were, and keep them on without molestation. The Government had adopted the Ame-

rican, the rectangular, system of surveying, and a very good system it is—I have not a word to say against it—but it seems nothing but fair and right that where there had been settlement in advance of surveys, the Government should have acknowledged that fact, and the surveys should have been made according to the settlements. It is characteristic of all French settlements in America that they have all been made upon the banks of rivers and all the lands divided so that the people can live close to one another. That is a feature of the French race. The French race, it will be admitted without dispute, is of a more sociable disposition than the Teutonic race. The characteristics of the two races are distinctly marked in Lower Canada. In Lower Canada, if you go through an old country settlement you will find the farm houses scattered in all directions, wherever is most convenient for the farmer. They may be one mile or more apart; but the moment you go into the French settlements you will find all the farm houses on the road side, all within a stone's throw of one another, so as to afford the people easy and constant communication. In fact, the people of Lower Canada, in all the French settlements, are in constant and daily communication.

THIS IS A CHARACTERISTIC

not only of French settlements in Lower Canada, but of all French settlements in America. It is the same in old France. The rural population in France chiefly dwell in hamlets, and in Lower Canada as close to one another as the circumstances of the country will allow. And I found this feature in the old Acadian settlements in Nova Scotia. In King's country, for instance, in the old classic land of Evangeline, there was a settlement in the old days that was called Rieière aux Canards, there the farms have been settled in narrow strips; all are close to each other, and the settlement is called to-day, so far as I know,

by the suggestive name Canard Street. That, in the eyes of the population, represents a street more than an ordinary farm settlement. The adventurers whose blood now runs in the veins of the half-breed population in the North-West, came from France and Lower Canada. The same trait exists among them. The half-breed population in the North-West to-day, wherever they have a settlement, have taken their lands

IN EXACTLY THE SAME WAY

as have all the French population, whether on the banks of the St Lawrence, in Acadia or in Louisiana. When the Government took possession of the North-West they found those settlements on the Saskatchewan River in exactly the same fashion as all other French settlements. The lands were divided into narrow strips, and the farms were all close upon one another. Was it anything but right and fair that the holdings of those people should be respected: that the lands which had been divided by the people among themselves should not be interfered with, and that the retrangular surveys should give way so soon as they came incontact with settlements. This was the policy followed by the honorable member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when he was in charge of the Department of the Interior. I noticed yesterday that the First Minister, when he addressed himself to this subject, passed rather gently, lightly and sweetly over it. He did not say much upon it. He merely said that the honorable member for Bothwell, when at the head of the Department, had not been so diligent as he might have been. But he extolled his own activity. He said that the Government of which he was a member had displayed the greatest diligence in the matter. Not only did the honorable gentlemen make that double assertion, but he said he would prove it. And then, with a somewhat ostentatious manner, he took a map and had laid it on the Table.

Look at the map, he said, and it will show how much we have surveyed. And so soon as the House rose I saw a number of the honorable gentleman's followers, who had deep faith and reposed confidence in his word, go to the Table and look for evidences of the energy and activity of their leader; and, from the blank stare which was seen on their faces, it was evident that the map did not show much, that it did not show anything—for the facts are these: the surveys have been carried on by the honorable member for Bothwell when in charge of the Department.

Mr. Hesson:— The honorable member for Bothwell surveyed less than 2,000,000 acres. The former Conservative Government surveyed more than 9,000,000 acres and the present Government more than 55,000,000 acres.

Mr. Laurier:— The honorable gentleman knows that the world was not created in a day. The first thing to be done in order to make surveys wos to draw the meridian lines, and the reports show that my honorable friend directed his efforts in 1877

TO DRAWING MERIDIAN LINES

in order to proceed with the survey of townships. That was the first thing to be done. I hope this explanation will satisfy the honorable member for North Perth. In fact, as far back as 1876 my honorable friend had addressed himself to this subject, and addressed himself to it in that thorough manner in which he approaches any subject. Governor Laird in 1877 addressed my honorable friend as follows upon the subject of surveys:—

> The subject is one materially affecting the prosperity of these and other settlements in the Territory. I would hope, therefore, that the labors of a special survey party will be continued during the ensuing summer.

That was in February, 1877, showing that as far

back as the summer previous, that is to say the summer of 1876, the honorable gentleman had commenced the special survey. And what was the answer of the honorable gentleman? He gave an answer apposite to the question, not only saying that there would be surveys, but that the surveys would be made according to the holdings of the people. This is what the honorable gentleman wrote upon that occasion:—

The programme of the special survey party provides for the work being extended during the coming season to intersect the Saskatchewan in the vicinity of the principal settlements on that river. It is proposed in all cases where settlements have been formed along the rivers in the territory to adapt the surveys to the farms as existing, that is to say, giving a frontage of 10 or 20 chains on the river, and running the lots back so as to give 160 acres.

THAT WAS THE POLICY

of my honorable friend (Mr. Mills) in 1877, which had been inaugurated even in the previous year. But I admit this: the people were impatient. The surveys could not proceed as rapidly as they desired, and the reason is given in the papers brought down to-day. The surveys could not be proceeded with because the meridian lines had first to be established. They again approached the Government upon this matter, and as my honorable friend stated—I need not give the authority, as it was quoted yesterday—that policy would have been pursued as speedily as could be permitted. But in 1878 there was a change of Government, and this I charge upon honorable gentlemen opposite, that with the change of Government came a change of policy as well, and that instead of henceforth respecting the holdings of the people and having special surveys where settlements had preceded survey, they subjected the people, whether their lands were settled or not, to the system of the rectangular survey. They sacrificed the peace of their country to the whim

of having a uniform rectangular survey. Sir, when this new system of survey was first commenced, there were, as may be imagined, complaints in that territory. The people who had settled upon narrow front lots complained of that system, and as far back as March, 1882, Mr. Duck, the agent at Prince Albert, addressed this letter to the Department:—

As the majority of the settlers on the south branch of the Saskatchewan River, in the vicinity of the parish of St. Laurent, have taken up their lands previous to the survey with narrow frontages, similar to those river claims in other parts of the district, and in view of the difficulty likely to be experienced in this office in adjusting the boundaries of these claims, in accordance with the section surveys, I have, at the request of the settlers so situated, the honor to request information as to the possibility of re-surveying these sections into river lots on a similar plan to that adopted in Prince Albert settlement.

That was on the 11th March, 1882, and, on the 4th September, Mr. Duck had not yet received an answer from the Department; and not having received an answer to those complaints which he had sent to Ottawa at the request of the settlers, the settlers

THEMSELVES TRIED THEIR LUCK

in the matter. They petitioned the Government in these words:

We desire also that you should give orders that the lands should be surveyed along the river in lots 10 chains wide and two miles long. It is the old usage of the country to divide the lands in this manner, and it would facilitate us in knowing the boundaries of our respective lands.

Then, on the 13th of October, an official answer came from the Department of the Interior stating as follows:—

But as regards the surveying of the land in question

all lands in the North-West Territories will be surveyed according to the system now in force.

That was the policy adopted and promulgated by the Department of the Interior on the 13th October, 1882, that henceforth all lands should be surveyed in the North-West Territories on the new system, no matter whether they were occupied or not, or whether they were settled or not. On the 21st of October, Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, at last answered the letter of Mr. Duck, which had been written on the 11th of March previously, and this is what he said:

.....It is not the intention of the Government to cause any re-survey to be made. Of course, any sub-division, differing from the regular survey, they may desire, they can procure for themselves when the lands come into their possession. You will please, therefore, communicate this decision to the persons interested.

When the settlers asked to have the surveys made according to their holdings, the answer was peremptorily: no, you will tell the people that if they want their lands sub-divided afterwards, they can do so, but henceforth the system of survey will be that adopted by the Government. I ask any man in this House, I ask any impartial man, could there be any more vexatious tyranny than that which was thus exercised by the Government over the people of the Saskatchewan River, who had laid out their land in narrow lots, who had built their fences accordingly, who had placed their houses accordingly, who had tilled the soil, and made improvements accordingly—could there be any more vexatious tyranny than that exercised by the Government when they came forward and ran their lines upon these holdings, irrespective of the possession of the people, or the improvements they had made? Could there be

ANY GREATER TYRANNY

than running their lines across a man's farm and his buildings, as if these lands were unoccupied or unsettled upon? That was a piece of tyranny without excuse. I say there can be no excuse whatever for the course of the Government in that matter. I say it would have been cheap justice in their hands if they had listened to the prayers of the half-breeds and told them: we will respect your possessions such as you have them. Not only so, but the missionaries of the land, the men of peace, who as a rule in that country do not interfere with the people's business, so far as that goes, thought it their duty to remonstrate time and again. Father Leduc came here and interviewed the Government; Father André wrote letters, and Father Vigreville wrote letters, which were quoted by my honorable friend,—as eloquent letters as could be written, letters which were pleading for the just rights of the people, but they remained unanswered. It is asked what are the grievances of the people of the North-West Territories? I ask any man, could there be a greater grievance, even in the old provinces of Canada, than that, the Government should attempt to re-survey the lands according to a new, regular and scientific system. I say that if such a thing were attempted, there would be an outbreak here as there was there. Nothing is

DEARER TO EVERY POOR MAN

than his poor patch of land, reclaimed from the wilderness by his own toil, and it was an unjustifiable and unwarrantable piece of tyranny on the part of the Government to act as they did. I can understand why these people, goaded as they were by this systematic ignoring of their claims, at last resorted to a most unfortunate course. Men have rebelled time and again for less just causes than these people had. Look at the conduct of the Government. For 6 long

years, the people of the North-West have been petitioning for their rights; for 6 long years they had used every constitutional means which the law could place at their disposal in order to get justice. They sent petitions; they met in assemblies; they passed resolutions; they sent in delegations. The petitions remained unanswered; the resolutions adopted in their meetings were ignored. The delegations were received most courteously, with sweet smiles and sweeter words, which were put down in writing, but were forgotten as soon as the delegates had turned their backs for home. For these long years, the Government never moved. After these long years of useless petitioning, the half-breeds resorted to a most significant course; they sent for Louis Riel, and brought him into the country. This should at last have opened the eyes of the Government. They knew that Riel was a daring man; they knew that the people of the North-West had their hearts filled with ever accumulating bitterness, and they must have known that under the circumstances there were all the elements for a sudden conflagration, the results of which might be, as they have proved to be, disastrous. Yet the Government never moved, Louis Riel did not remain idle; he held numerous meetings, which were attended, not only by the half-breeds, but by the white settlers; the situation was discussed; the people's grievances were set forth; yet the Government never moved. The Government

COULD NOT PLEAD IGNORANCE,

because the press of the country, the papers published on the Saskatchewan and the papers published in Manitoba, supporting the Government, warned them time and again of what was going on; yet they never moved. Moreover, the officers of the Government warned them again and again. If you look at the correspondences you will find that Mr. Duck, the local agent at Prince Albert, again and again urged

upon the Government the necessity of remedying individual grievances, and his letters always remained unanswered. You will find that Mr. Pearce, a most indefatigable officer of the Government, time and again pointed out the dangers ahead, and suggested remedies; but the Government never moved. What was it the half-breeds were asking for? Anything unjust or unfair? It was so just that it had been granted to the half-breeds of Manitoba; it was so just that it was granted by the Government themselves at last, when it was too late; yet when it was time the Government never moved. But if the Government remained passive, public opinion became alarmed. Distant as that country was, difficult as was the communication with it, sometimes a faint echo reached here of what was going on in that Territory. As far back as 1883 my honorable friend the leader of the Opposition called the attention of the Government to the complaints which were made by the people of the Territories. He was met on that occasion by the Prime Minister telling him that all was well. But the member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) then sounded a note of alarm, and pointed out that there were possibilities of danger. Such warnings coming from such a staunch supporter of the Administration should at least have excited the attention of the Government; yet they never moved. Again, in the following session, my friend the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) set forth the grievances of the North-West, and asked for a committee. The Government answered that

EVERYTHING WAS SERENE

there; they would not move. This present session my honorable friend again called the attention of the Government to the state of the country when he moved the bill for the representation of the North-West Territories. That bill came on for its second reading on the 11th of March. At that time the

atmosphere was already vibrating with the first waves of the great storm that was soon to roll over the land. The Government could not fail to be aware of what was going on. In fact, we have proof that at that time their agents were sounding the note of alarm in their ears; yet they never moved. The Minister of Public Works rose up in his place, and very quietly moved the adjournment of the debate. That was all the encouragement given to those people. Even at that time it was perhaps not too late. If the Government had shown any good-will at all, it is possible that the people, hearing of it, would have modified their attitude, and this outbreak would perhaps have been spared to us. Later on we had the speech of the right honorable Prime Minister which I have already quoted, telling us that the Government relied on their friends for support, that their consciences told them that they had done everything that could be done to pacify the country. Such boasting of the Government on the eve of a rebellion which they had brought on the land by their own misconduct, is I believe unparallelled in history, unless indeed we recall the language of Emile Ollivier in the *Corps Legislatif* in 1870, when he said he was going to war with a light heart, when he was plunging his country in the greatest calamities that ever befell a nation. And to crown the whole we have a letter from the Secretary of State, saying on the 6th of June:

> If the half-breeds have serious grievances against the Canadian Government, the ordinary channel of petition was open to them as to all free citizens. They did not avail themselves of it.

Sir, this is simply adding insult to injury. The half-breeds did not petition?

WHAT MORE COULD THEY DO

than they have done in a constitutional manner? To tell the truth, for these long years they have been pe-

titioning and petitioning, begging and begging, knocking and knocking at the door of the Government, and the Government never lifted a finger to come to their rescue; that is the truth of the matter. The Government never did anything to meet the wishes, the prayers of those people. Yes, I beg pardon, they did something; they sent a police force to Carlton. When the people were petitioning for their rights and holding meetings to discuss their grievances, the Government became aware of what was going on, and instead of remedying their grievances, sent a police force to Carlton in order to overawe the people. That is the sort of justice they got from the Government of Canada until they rose in insurrection. Sir, if something more than everything else could condemn the action of this Government, it would be this act of sending the police force to Carlton to meet the petitions of the people by an armed force. This is not British justice; this is not British administration; this is not the manner in which a British Government usually meets the demands of its subjects; but, Sir, this is

THE RUSSIAN WAY OF ADMINISTERING LAW.

This is the way Russia meets the demands of Poland. Whenever the Poles rise and claim their rights, the Russians do exactly what has been done by the Canadian Government—they send armed troops to Warsaw. Now, there is in connection with this matter another point which I have not heard referred to, but which seems to be in the minds of a good many people. It is not expressed, but I think the feeling permeates the very atmosphere, not only of this House, but of the whole of this country. I have not heard it stated, but it is in the minds of many that if these men have rebelled, it is because they are, to a certain extent, of French origin. The First Minister stated yesterday that Gabriel Dumont and his friends are and always were rebels. It is not to my knowledge that Dumont or any one of those, who took up arms on the Saskat-

chewan any more than on the Red River, ever had the thought of rebelling against the authority of Her Majesty. It was not against Her Majesty the Queen they rebelled, but against the tyranny of the Canadian Government. It is quite possible that the half-breeds, just reclaimed from a nomadic life, having practically been under the authority of the British rule not more than 7 or 8 years, have not yet learned to love the British flag, because so far the flag in the hands of honorable gentlemen opposite has not carried that justice which has gone with the British flag everywhere for the last fifty years. But this I say, and I say it coming from a province where, less than 50 years ago, every man of the race to which I belong was a rebel, and where to-day every man of that race is a true and loyal subject, as true and as loyal as any that breathes—I say give these men justice, give them freedom, give them their rights, treat them as for the last 40 years you have treated the people of Lower Canada, and by-and-bye, throughout those Territories, you will have contentment, peace and harmony where to-day discord, hatred and war are ruining the land

THE EXECUTION OF RIEL

A RESOUNDING PROTEST

ANOTHER INDICTMENT AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

THE "SILVER-TONGUED LAURIER."

(Speech delivered in the House of Commons on the 16th March 1886)

We particularly recommend the careful perusal of this speech, as it is considered the finest ever delivered in Parliament and may be regarded, perhaps, as Mr. Laurier's best effort. On the day after its delivery, the English press of the Dominion applied to Mr. Laurier for the first time the epithet of "the silver-tongued Laurier". It is needless to relate the circumstances under which it was made, as they are known to all and moreover this volume contains a series of speeches, which supply a complete history of the North-West question. The half-breed leader, Louis Riel, had been executed. Mr. Blake, the then leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Laurier undertook to convince their colleagues that the real culprit was not Riel, who had been hanged, but the Government, who had knowingly and deliberately goaded the half-breeds to desperation and revolt. Before an impartial tribunal,

the undertaking would have been triumphant; but the powerful orators addressed themselves to a Parliamentary majority, who could not admit the evidence of facts without repudiating and stultifying their previous record on the subject. Occasions such as these show how deplorably government by party, favorable as it is to the proper working of the representative system, too often stifles independence of character. This is the chief impression left by the following remarkable piece of eloquence:

MR. SPEAKER,

Since no one on the other side of the House has the courage to continue this debate, I will do so myself. The Minister of Public Works stated that the Government were ready and anxious to discuss this question, and is this an evidence of the courage they pretend to possess? Sir, in all that has been said so far, and that has fallen from the lips of honorable gentlemen opposite, there is one thing in which we can all agree, and one thing only—we can all agree in the tribute which was paid to the volunteers by the Minister of Public Works when he entered into a defence of the Government. The volunteers had a most painful duty to perform, and they performed it in a most creditable manner to themselves and the country. Under the uniform of a soldier there is generally to be found a warm and merciful heart. Moreover, our soldiers are citizens who have an interest in this country; but when they are on duty they know nothing but duty. At the same time it can fairly be presumed that when on duty the heart feels and the mind thinks; and it may be fairly presumed that those who were on duty in the North-West last spring thought and felt as a great soldier, a great king, King Henry IV of France, thought and felt when engaged in battle for many years of his life, in fighting his rebellious subjects. Whenever his sword inflicted a wound he used these words:

"THE KING STRIKES THEE, GOD HEAL THEE."

It may be presumed that perhaps our soldiers,

when fighting the rebellion, were also animated by a similar spirit, and prayed to God that he would heal the wounds that it was their duty to inflict, and that no more blood should be shed than the blood shed by themselves. The Government, however, thought otherwise. The Government thought that the blood shed by the soldiers was not sufficient, but that another life must also be sacrificed. We heard the Minister of Public Works attempting to defend the conduct of the Government, and stating that its action in this matter was a stern necessity which duty to our Queen and duty to our country made inevitable. Mr. Speaker, I have yet to learn—and I have not learned it from anything that has fallen from the lips of gentlemen opposite—that duty to Queen and country may ever prevent the exercise of that prerogative of mercy which is the noblest prerogative of the Crown. The language of the honorable gentleman was not the first occasion when responsible or irresponsible advisers of the Crown attempted to delude the public, and perhaps themselves as well, into the belief that duty to Queen and country required blood, when mercy was a possible alternative.

WHEN ADMIRAL BYNG

was sentenced to be shot for no other crime than that of being unfortunate in battle, there were men at the time, who said to the King that the interests of the country required that the sentence should be carried out, though the court, which had convicted him, strongly recommended him to mercy. Those evil counsels prevailed, and the sentence was carried out; but the verdict of history, the verdict of posterity—posterity to which honorable gentlemen now appeal—has declared long ago that the carrying out of the sentence against Admiral Byng was a judicial murder. And I venture to predict, Mr. Speaker, that the verdict of history will be the same in this instance. In every instance in which a Government has carried

out the extreme penalty of the law, when mercy was suggested instead, the verdict has been the same. Sir, in the province to which I belong, and especially amongst the race to which I belong, the execution of Louis Riel has been universally condemned as being the sacrifice of a life, not to inexorable justice, but to bitter passion and revenge. And now, Sir, before going any further, it is fitting that, perhaps, I should address myself at once to the state of things which has sprung up in Quebec from the universal

CONDEMNATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

not only by their foes, but by their friends as well. The movement which has followed the execution of Riel has been strangely misconceived, or I should say, has been wilfully misrepresented. The Tory press of Ontario at once turned bitterly and savagely upon their French allies of twenty-five years or more. They assailed them not only in their action but in their motives. They charged them with being animated with nothing less than race prejudices; they not only charged their former friends, but the whole French race as well, that the only motive which led them to take the course they did in the matter of Riel, was simply because Riel was of French origin. They charged against the whole race that they would step between a criminal and justice, the moment the criminal was one of their own race. They charged against the whole French race that they would prevent the execution of the law the moment the law threatened one of their own. Mr. Speaker, in this matter I am not desirous of following the example which has been set before us by honorable gentlemen opposite of citing copious newspaper extracts, although I could cite extracts of the most bitter nature that ever was penned, of the *Mail* newspaper and other Tory organs against French Canadians. I will not import into this debate any more acrimony than can be avoided, but I simply quote a single paragraph

from the *Mail*—and one of the most moderate—which will show the general spirit of the attacks made upon us. On the 7th of December last, the *Mail* wrote as follows, speaking of the French Canadians :—

> Their leaders are paying us back at the present time by asserting that they should have the right of suspending the operation of law against treason whenever they choose to demand its suspension in the interests of a traitor of French origin, even though he may have been twice guilty.

Sir, I denounce this

AS A VILE CALUMNY.

I denounce this as false. I claim this for my fellow-countrymen of French origin that there is not to be found anywhere under Heaven a more docile, quiet and law-abiding people. I claim this for my fellow-countrymen of French origin—and I appeal to the testimony of any of those who know them and have lived amongst them—that whatever their faults may be, it is not one of their faults to shield, conceal and abet crime. It is true that upon the present occasion the French Canadians have shown an unbounded sympathy for the unfortunate man who lost his life upon the scaffold on the 16th November last. But if they came to that conclusion, it was not because they were influenced by race preferences or race prejudices, if you choose to call them such. They were no more influenced in their opinion by race prejudice, than were the foreign papers which deprecated the execution of Riel. It is a fact that the foreign press, the American press, the English press, the French press, almost withont any exception, have taken the ground that the execution of Riel was unjustified, unwarranted and against the spirit of the age. Certainly, it cannot be charged against that press that they were influenced by race feelings or prejudices, if you choose to call them such. And in the same

manner. I say, the French Canadians, in the attitude which they took, were not impelled by race prejudices, but by reasons fairly deducible and deduced from the facts of the case. But if it had been stated that race prejudices, that blood relations had added keenness, and feeling to a conviction formed by the mind, that would have been perfectly true. I will not admit that blood relations can so far cloud my judgment as to make me mistake wrong for right, but I cheerfully admit add I will plead guilty to that weakness, if weakness it be, that if an injustice be committed against a fellow-being, the blow will fell deeper into my heart if it should fall upon one of my kith and kin. I will not admit anything more than that. That race prejudices can so far cloud my judgment as to make me mistake wrong from right, I do not believe to be true. Before I go further, I desire to say this: It has been stated, time and again, by the *Mail* newspaper and by other Tory organs, that it was the present intention of the French Canadian leaders

TO ORGANIZE A PURELY FRENCH CANADIAN PARTY,

to lay aside all party ties and to have no other bonds of party in this House but that tie of race. I protest against any such assertion. Such an assertion is unfounded, it is calculated to do harm, it not founded on truth. It would be simply suicidal to French Canadians to form a party by themselves. Why, so soon as French Canadians, who are in the minority in this House and in the country, were to organize as a political party, they would compel the majority to organize as a political party, and the result must be disastrous to themselves. We have only one way of organizing parties. This country must be governed and can be governed simply on questions of policy and administration, and French Canadians who have had any part in this movement have never had any other intention but to organize upon those party distinctions and upon no other. In order to lay this

question at rest, I cannot do better than to quote the language of the honorable member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins)at a meeting that took place recently at Longueuil. That meeting took place in January, I believe. Mr Benoit, the honorable member for the county, had been invited, but had not put in an appearance, and the fact had been commented on by some speakers who had addressed the meeting. Mr. Desjardins spoke as follows:—

Mr. Benoit has perhaps done well to hesitate, because I have myself hesitated, seeing at the head of the invitation I received, "Parti National." If it be understood by "Parti National" that it is a party other than those already existing, I am not of that party; but if it be understood that Liberals and Conservatives shall unite in the same idea and present a united front when their national interests may be imperilled, I am of that party.In our movements we have not desired that a criminal should escape death because he is a French Canadian; but because as regards Jackson and Riel, if the first had his life saved, the second should have had it also. We do not want any more privileges; we are strong enough, but what we want is justice for all.

It has been said by sober-minded people that the execution,

EVEN IF UNJUST,

of the man who was executed and who is believed to have been insane by those who sympathize with him, does not make this a case for the outburst of feeling which has taken place in Quebec on the occasion of Riel's execution. I differ from that view. In our age, in our civilization, every single human life is valuable, and is entitled to protection in the councils of the nation. Not many years ago England sent an expedition and spent millions of her treasure and some of her best blood simply to rescue prisoners whose lives were in the hands of the King of Abyssinia. In the same manner I say that the life of a single subject of

Her Majesty here is valuable, and is not to be treated with levity. If there are members in the House who believe that the execution of Riel was not warranted, that under the circumstances of the case it was not judicious, that it was unjust, I say they have a right to arraign the Government for it before this country, and, if they arraign the Government for it and the Government have to take their trial upon it, it must be admitted as a consequence that certain parties will feel upon the question more warmly than others. It is not to be supposed that the same causes which influenced public opinion in Lower Canada acted in the same manner with all classes of the community; that the causes which actuated the community at large were identical in all classes of the community. Some there were who believed that the Government had not meted out the same measure of justice to all those that were accused and who took part in the rebellion. Others believed that the state of mind of Riel was such that it was

A JUDICIAL MURDER

to execute him; but the great mass of the people believed that mercy should have been extended to all the prisoners, Riel included, because the rebellion was the result of the policy followed by the Government against the half-breeds. That was the chief reason which actuated them, and it seems to me that it is too late in the day to seriously attempt to deny that the rebellion was directly the result of the conduct of the Government towards the half-breeds. It is too late in the day to dispute that fact. Yet we have heard it disputed in this House. By whom? By the last man who, I should have expected, would have disputed it —by the hon. member (Mr. Royal). He gave us the other day his version of

THE ORIGIN OF THE TROUBLE.

Everybody is responsible for the rebellion except

one body. The *Globe* is responsible for it; the Farmers' Union is responsible for it; the white settlers are responsible for it. Everybody you can conceive of is responsible for it, except the Government. The Government is perfectly innocent of it, as innocent as a new-born child! Such was the statement made by the hon. member the other day. But if the hon. member is now in earnest as to that matter, how is it that the half-breeds alone have been prosecuted? If the *Globe* is the cause of that rebellion, the *Globe* should have been the first to be indicted. If the white settlers were the instigators of the rebellion, the white settlers should have been indicted also. There is more than that. The counsel for the Crown received authority and even instructions specially to proceed against the instigators of the rebellion, the white settlers, who certainly

WOULD HAVE BEEN MORE GUILTY

than the half-breeds whom they had instigated to rebellion. Here is part of the instructions given by the late Minister of Justice to the counsel for the Crown:

> It must be, and from the information which the Government have, it seems probable—

It seems the Government share the opinion of the hon. member for Provencher, and they profess to act accordingly—

> It must be, and from the information which the Government have, it seems probable that the rebellion has been encouraged actively by whites, particularly in Prince Albert. Nothing in the whole duty entrusted to you is, I apprehend, more important than that we should if possible find out some of the men who, with far better knowledge than the half-breeds, stirred them up to rebellion, and your special attention is asked to this point.

The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) does not seem to have given any help to the counsel for the Crown, notwithstanding the knowledge which enables him to say on the floor of Parliament, with the responsibility attaching to his utterances, that the white settlers are responsible for the rebellion. If they are, how comes it that no white settler has yet been indicted—that every white settler is at large? What are we to infer from this? Are we to infer that the Government has receded from the position which was here taken by Sir Alexander Campbell? Or are we to infer that the statement of the hon. member for Provencher is only one of those wild assertions made as a last expedient in the defence of acts otherwise indefensible? The hon. gentlemen went further. He not only charged the white settlers, the Farmers' Union and the *Globe* newspaper, but he also held responsible the Mackenzie Administratiou. He said that the administration of that Government, from the time that they took office to the time they left, had been null and that the history of their administration in the North-West had been a perfect blank. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a charge which cannot be made against the present Administration. Their administration was not at all one blank.

BLOOD! BLOOD! BLOOD!

prisons, scaffolds, widows, orphans, destitution, ruin —these are what fill the blank in the administration of this Government of the affairs of the North-West. Mr. Speaker, there might be something to say, as the hon. gentleman will apprehend, upon the administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) of the affairs of the North-West Territories, but the present would not be a seasonable time, and the occasion may arise hereafter. Let me, however, tell this to the hon. gentleman: if the administration of Mr. Mackenzie was blameable for its treatment of the affairs of the North-West, if they were remiss in

their duties, how much more blameable must be the present Administration, which have not yet done that which should have been done by their predecessors? But I forget; the honorable gentleman has nothing, or, at least, very little, to say against the present Government. It may be possible that they have not been alltogether diligent in the duties they had to perform, but still they have shown a great deal of good will—at least, so say the honorable gentleman. Here is what he says:—

> In 1880, Sir John Macdonald took the first opportunity he had, in order to bring in a bill into this House—he himself, the leader of the Conservative party, introduced a bill into Parliament to extend the same privileges and rights to the half-breeds in the territories as those enjoyed under the Manitoba Act by the half-breeds in the province of Manitoba.

This statement is correct, except with regard to the date which should have been 1879 instead of 1880. Sir John Macdonald, as he says, introduced a bill to extend to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories

THE SAME PRIVILEGES

as had been granted to those of Mamitoba. That was done in 1879, and the Act which I hold in my hand reads as follows:

> That the following powers are hereby delegated to the Governor in Council to satisfy any claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian titles preferred by the half-breeds resident in the North-West Territories, outside the limits of Manitoba previous to the 15th day of July, 1870, by granting land to such persons to such extent and on such terms and conditions as may from time to time be deemed expedient.

The provisions of this statute were repeated in the Act of 1883. But before we proceed further, it may be important to at once define what were those privileges and rights which were extended to the half-breeds of

Manitoba. By the Act of 1870 it was decreed as follows:—

And whereas it is expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the province to appropriate a portion of such ungranted lands to the extent of 1,400,000 acres thereof for the benefit of the families of the half-breeds residents, it is hereby enacted that the Lieutenant-Governor, under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor-General in Council, shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the province as he may deem expedient, to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of heads of families residing in the province at the time of the said transfer to Canada.

And by a further Act, the Act of 1874, the same privileges were extended. not only to heads of families but to minors, the children of half-breeds, as defined in section 32 of that Act. These Acts, as they were administered, assigned, first, to each head of family the plot of land of which he happened to be in possession at the time of the transfer, to the extent of 160 acres; and besides that

THE HALF-BREEDS WERE ALSO GRANTED,

for the extinguishment of the Indian title. 160 acres of land or scrip for 160 acres of land; and each minor, 240 acres or scrip for that quantity. In 1879 the First Minister took power to extend the same privileges to the half-breeds of the North-West. It will be seen that the half-breeds of Manitoba were treated as a special class. They were not treated as Indians; they were not treated as whites but as participating in the rights of both the whites, and the Indians. If they had been treated as Indians, they would have been sent to their reserves; if they had been treated as whites, they would have been granted homesteads; but as I have said, they were treated as a special class, participating in both rights of whites and Indians; as whites they were given a homestead of 160 acres on the plot.

of land of which they happened to be in possession; as Indians, they were given scrip for lands to the extent of 160 acres for each head of family, and 240 acres for minors. In 1879, as I have said, the Government passed a statute similar to the statute of Manitoba. Did they act upon it? When did they act upon it? When was the first thing done by the Government of Canada to put in force the Act of 1879? The first thing ever done by the Government af Canada to put in force the Act they themselves had passed, was on the 28th January, 1885.

SIX LONG YEARS

elapsed before they attempted to do that justice to the half-breeds, which they had taken power from Parliament to do, at the time. During all that time the Government was perfectly immovable. The honorable member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) told us the Government have done their duty by the half-breeds. Sir, if the Government had done their duty by the half-breeds, how is it that the half-breeds so often petitioned the Government to grant them their rights? How is it that they so often deluged the Department with petitions and deputations? How is it that they so often appealed to the honorable member for Provencher himself? How is it, for instance, that on the 19th of November, 1882, Maxime Lepine, now a prisoner in the Manitoba penitentiary, Baptiste Boucher, wounded in cattle, Charles Lavallée, wounded in battle, Isidore Dumas, killed in battle, and several others addressed Mr. Duck, the agent at Prince Albert, asking him to try and induce the Government to grant them their rights, representing at the same time that they had petitioned, and that their petitions had been supported by prominent men, amongst others the honorable Mr. Royal, the member for Provencher, and all without avail? How is it that these men, in order to obtain the rights which were denied them, have gone through such an ordeal as they have, if the

Government did justice by them ? An agitation was going on all the time in the North-West, and the Government were perfectly immovable. The honorable member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) stated the other day that the Government during all those years were

SLUMBERING AND SNORING.

I believe that expression was none too strong, because we have evidence of its truth in the Government's own blue book. Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, we have evidence that the Department had forgotten the law which they themselves had placed on the statute book ; we have evidence that the Government actually forgot that the half-breeds were entitled to special privileges. The thing is almost incredible ; yet here is the evidence of it. There was a meeting held at Prince Albert of the settlers of the locality, to take into consideration their own grievances and the grievances of the half-breeds as well ; amongst the resolutions carried was the following, the third one :—

3rd.—Moved by Mr. Miller, seconded by M. Spencer, and carried unanimously :—Whereas the Indian title in this district or territory has not become extinct, and the old settlers and half-breed population of Manitoba were granted scrip in commutation of such title and such allowance has not been made to those resident in this territory :— *Resolved*, that the right honorable Minister of the Interior be requested to grant such scrip to such settlers, thus placing them on an equal footing with their *confrères* in Manitoba.

This resolution simply asked that the half-breeds of the North-West should be treated just as

THE HALF-BREEDS OF MANITOBA

were treated—just as the honorable member for Provencher said they should have been treated ; and what was the answer of the Department ? The answer

of the Department will show precisely what I have stated, that the Department at that time in 1881 had forgotten the tenor of the statute they had placed on the statute book before. Here is the answer, addressed to the honorable Lawrence Clarke, who had transmitted the petition :

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OTTAWA
22nd Nov., 1881.

Sir,—By direction of the Minister of the Interior, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of memorial handed in by you, of certain resolutions passed at a meeting of the inhabitants of the district of Lorne (which you represent in the North-West Council), held at Prince Albert on the 18th October, 1881.

In reply to the questions involved in the several resolutions contained therein, I am to say as follows :—

.....

Resolution No. 3. As by treaty with the Indians their title to any portion of the territory included within the district of Lorne has been extinguished, this resolution would need explanation.

HERE WAS A RESOLUTION

calling upon the Government to give effect to a law passed by themselves—to give the half-breeds the special rights to which by law they were entitled, and yet the Government declares that this resolution requires explanation. Well, the explanation came, and it was not long in coming. Mr. Clarke answered as follows :—

CARLTON, N.W.T., 25th JANUARY, 1882.

Sir,—I have the honor to aoknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd November last, embodying the reply of the right honorable the Minister of the Interior to a memorial, handed in by me, of certain resolutions passed at a meeting of the inhabitants of the district of Lorne, held at Prince Albert on the 18th October, 1881.

With regard to resolution No. 3, it is remarked that :

" As by treaty with the Indians, their title to any port ion of

the territory included within the district of Lorne has been extinguished, this resolution would need explanation."

I would respectfully submit that the Indian title no doubt has been extinguished, but evidently not that of the half-breed residents of the North-West Territories.

The Government of the Dominon of Canada have repeatedly acknowledged the right in the soil of the half-breed inhabitants, as is proved by the Parliament of Canada in 1870, 33 Vic., chap. 3, section 31, as follows.

Then he recites all the acts by which the Parliament of Canada had declared, time and again, that the half-breeds were entitled to compensation for their Indian title; and goes on:

It will be seen, therefore, that from the first enactment, in 1870, to the last, in 1879, the rights in the soil of the half-breeds have been recognized by the Government, and provision made for the extinguishment of their title.

This explanation was certainly clear enough, but the Government at once relapsed into the state of immovability in which they had been living, and the Minister fell again into the state of repose which he had been enjoying, for so many years before. The half-breeds petitioned again, they sent their friends upon delegations to Ottawa; they sent the honorable member for Provencher; yet the Government never took any action in the matter until the 28th of January, 1885, when the Minister felt his seat shaken by the first waves of the tempest that was soon to sweep over the country,

TOO LATE! TOO LATE! TOO LATE!

When the seeds of discontent have long been germinating, when hearts have long been swelling with long accumulating bitterness, and when humiliations and disappointments have made men discontented and sullen, a small incident will create a conflagration, just as a spark dropped on the prairie, under

certain circumstances, will kindle a widespread and unquenchable fire. Then the Government moved, but it was too late. The incident occurred—what was it? The honorable member for Provencher told us what it was. After the Government had announced a commission, a man had the imprudence to say that commission would not come, but that bullets would come instead; and this statement of the honorable gentleman is corroborated by a statement of Archbishop Taché in a letter published in December last, in which, speaking of the commencement of the rebellion, he said:

> The assurance that a commission would be sent was not accepted. People preferred to believe a rumor which went to show that, instead of granting them their rights, the authorities were to send irons for their leader and bullets for those who would protect him. That conviction produced the result which was to be expected. The half-breeds thought they would resist and defend themselves. Badly armed, without ammunition or provisions, they took possession of the stores in the vicinity. The unfortunate attack made against them at Duck Lake was a declaration of war.

It will strike many minds now that there is a great analogy between the origin of this rebellion and the origin of the rebellion in Lower Canada in 1837. An agitation had been going on in Lower Canada for many years, as it had been going on in the North-West for many years, and it was when the Government attempted to arrest the leaders of the movement that the rebellion broke out; and, without going any further, I am glad to recall the fact that, deplorable as was this rebellion in Lower Canada, it secured at once to the Lower Canadians the rights which they had been vainly seeking for so many years, and it secured this further result: That although the population had been hitherto in favor of rebellion they at once became

THE MOST FAITHFUL SUBJECTS

England ever had. In the same manner, though the

last result has not yet been obtained, it may be and will be obtained, I have no doubt, in the North-West, because the immediate result of the rebellion there has been to secure to the half-breeds the rights which had been denied to them up to that time. I have charged the Government with not only having been negligent in the duty they owed to the half-breeds, but with denying to the half-breeds the rights to which they were entitled. I charge them again with, not ignoring only, but actually refusing, of design aforethought, the rights to which the half-breeds were entitled. The first order the Government passed under the statute was that of the 28th January, 1885. What was that order? Its provisions are

IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER,

in view of the charge which I have preferred against the Government. The order runs as follows :—

On a memorandum dated 26th January, 1885, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting that it is desirable, with a view of settling equitably the claims of the half-breeds in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, who would have been entitled to land had they resided in Manitoba at the time of the transfer and filed their claims in due course under the Manitoba Act, and also of those who, though residing in Manitoba and equitably entitled to participate in the grant, did not do so, to ascertain the number of such half-breeds, and recommending that he be authorized to obtain an enumeration of them, and to employ three persons to make such enumeration.

The provisions of the order, you see, were first to cause an enumeration to be made of the half-breeds who were entitled to compensation, in order to settle equitably the claims of those half-breeds. What was to be that equitable settlement? The order is vague, it is silent. Was the settlement to be that which was granted to the half-breeds of Manitoba, as was insinuated the other day by the honorable member from Provencher (Mr. Royal)? I say no; I say that the

settlement that the Government then contemplated, and which is called equitable, was not the settlement which had been made in favor of the half-breeds of Manitoba. I may here recall what was the latter settlement. The half-breeds of Manitoba were given, first, a free grant of the plots of land which they occupied, to the extent of 160 acres each, as whites; they were given, in the second place, in

EXTINCTION OF THE INDIAN TITLE,

land to the extent of 160 acres for each head of a family, aad land or scrip to the extent of 240 acres for every minor. Was this to be the settlement which was to be given by the Government under order of the 28th January? I say it was not: and I call to witness upon this point the language spoken by the First Minister himself on the 26th March last, when this matter came before this House. On that occasion he said:

> As a whole the half-breeds have been told that if they desired to be considered as Indians there are most liberal reserves that they could go to with the others; but that if they desired to be considered white men they could get 160 acres of land as homesteads. Bnt they are not satisfied with that: they want to get land scrip of equal quantity—I think upwards of 200 acres—and then get, as a matter of course, their homesteads as well.

You see, therefore, that the Government, on the 26th March, 1885, was not disposed to treat the half-breeds of the North-West Territories as they had treated the half-breeds of Manitoba. If they had been disposed to do so, the First Minister would have said: We will give them, as we have given the half-breeds of Manitoba, the plots of land on which they reside, as free grants of 160 acres each, this to be their rights as homesteaders; and as Indians we will give them, in extinguishment of their rights to the Indian title, land scrip to the extent of 160 acres for each head of a family and 240 acres to each minor. No; the language

of the First Minister shows that he was opposed to their being treated in this way. He said: "If they wanted to be treated as Indians, they could go on the reserves; but if they wanted to be treated as whites, they could have a homestead like other whites." Therefore

I CHARGE THE GOVERNMENT

with this, that, when they passed the order of 28th January, 1885, it was not their intention to afford the same justice to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories that had been afforded to those of Manitoba. The intentions then expressed in the language I have just quoted from the First Minister were carried out four days later, on the 30th March, when another Order in Council was passed, and how did that Order in Council read? It read as follows:—

The Minister of the Interior is of the opinion that it is expedient that those claims should be satisfied by granting: First, to each half-breed head of a family resident in the North West Territories, outside of the limits of Manitoba previous to the 15th July, 1870, the lot or portion of land of which he is at present in *bona fide* and undisputed occupation by virtue of residence upon and cultivation thereof, to the extent of 160 acres, and if the lot or portion of land for which he is in *bona fide* occupation as aforesaid should be less than 160 acres, the difference to be made up to him by an issue of scrip, redeemable in land, at the rate of one dollar per acre, and in case of each half-breed head of a family residing in the North-West Territories previous to the 15th day of July, 1870, who is not at present in *bona fide* occupation of any land, scrip be issued, redeemable in land, to the extent of $160.

The same provision is thereafter made for the minors. Let us examine this Order in Council. What does it provide for? It provides simply this, that the half-breed shall get a grant of 160 acres as settler or homesteader, but that nothing shall be given him in extinguishment of his Indian title. If the half-breed is in possession of a plot of 160 acres, he is to receive a free grant of it—nothing more; if his lot is not 160

acres, he is to receive the difference—nothing more; so that it is manifest at that date, under this Order in Council, it was not the intention of the Government to give to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories the same rights that had been given to the half-breeds of Manitoba. The commission being issued under this order, it was not possible for the commissioners to do otherwise than to carry out the provisions contained in the order. They had no authority to go to any greater length than they were authorized by that order.

THE COMMISSION WAS ISSUED

to Mr. Street, Mr. Goulet and Mr. Forget, and as soon as they came to the North-West, as soon as they came to investigate the matter involved, they saw at once that this proposed settlement would be no settlement at all, that the half-breeds would be still dissatisfied; and upon the 4th April, Mr. Street telegraphed to Mr. Macpherson, then Minister of the Interior, as follows:—

If desired by half-breeds, would it not be advisable to grant scrip, one sixty or two forty dollars, permitting them to acquire title to lands in occupation through possession? Otherwise, Government really gives nothing for Indian title. Do you wish me to give notice that commission will take evidence of claims other than those of half-breeds? Pearce concurs in first suggestion.

Here is the telegram in which the commissioner at once points out that, if he carries out the Order in Council, the Government gives nothing to the half-breeds for the extinguishment of the Indian title. Then the next day, a letter followed up the telegram from Mr. Street, and it is still more significant:—

MY DEAR SIR DAVID,

We arrived here early this morning, and I met my fellow-commissioners at the Dominion Lands Office at 10 o'clock. They introduced the subject as to which I telegraphed you

yesterday, and spoke very strongly as to its being one which was likely to be a serious stumbling-block in our dealings with the half-breeds. Lest you should not fully have understood my telegram I will shortly state the point. Suppose we find that a half-breed has been upon and, since 15th July, 1870, in occupation of a parcel of say 160 acres, under circumstances which, if he were a white settler, would entitle him to a grant of the land under the homestead clauses under the Dominion Land Act, under the authority we now possess we could, if he were the head of a family, allow him nothing more than the 160 acres; we could allow him nothing for his claim as a half-breed, and, inasmuch as the Government has all along been purporting to deal with the half-breeds as if they had some general rights beyond those of ordinary incoming settlers, my fellow-commissioners say that great dissatisfaction and disappointment will be created if we give to these occupying half-breeds only that which any ordinary settler can claim, and nothing for the extinguishment of his Indian title. Mr. Pearce discussed the matter very fully with us and concurred in the advisability of our obtaining, if possible, the power to enable us to allow the half-breed to claim the land occupied by him under the homestead provisions, and in addition to give him his scrip for the $160 or $240, as the case may be, for the Indian title.

THERE WAS THE POLICY

which was suggested by Mr. Street as soon as he had commenced to investigate the matter, and what was the answer? The very following day there was this telegram which should have been sent six or seven years before at least:—

W. P. R. STREET, Q. C.,
Chairman, Half-breed Commission,
Winnipeg.

No objection to your suggestion to give scrip, and allow occupants to acquire title through possession, when desired by them.

At last justice have been given to these people. For seven long years they had petitioned, and peti-

tioned in vain. On the 26th March, the Prime Minister, in his place in this House, gave it as his policy that these men were not entitled to any special privileges, that they had no such rights as were given to their *confrères* in Manitoba, that they were to be treated not as half-breeds, not as a special class, but either as Indians or whites. At last justice was coming to them. At last what they had been petitioning for so many years was coming to them, and what was the cause? In ten days, from the 26th of March to the 6th of April, the Government had altered their policy and had given what they had refused for years. What was the cause? The bullets of Duck Lake; the rebellion in the North-West. The Government had been refusing for years, and at last these men took their lives and liberties in their hands, and at last the Government came down and gave them what they were entitled to. I appeal now to any friend of liberty in this House; I appeal not only to the Liberals who sit beside me, but to any man who has

A BRITISH HEART IN HIS BREAST,

and I ask, when subjects of Her Majesty have been petitioning for years for their rights, and those rights have not only been ignored, but have been denied, and when these men take their lives in their hands and rebel, will anyone in this House say that these men, when they got their rights, should not have saved their heads as well, and that the criminals, if criminals there were, in this rebellion, are not those who fought and bled and died, but the men who sit on those Treasury benches? Sir, rebellion is always an evil, it is always an offence against the positive law of a nation, it is not always a moral crime. The Minister of Militia, in the week that preceded the execution of Riel, stated his sentiments of rebellion in these words: "I hate all rebels; I have no sympathy, good, bad or indifferent, with rebellion." Sir, what is hateful—I use the word which the honorable gentleman

made use of—what is hateful is not rebellion, but is the despotism which induces rebellion; what is hateful are not rebels, but the men who, having the enjoyment of power, do not discharge the duties of power; the men who, having the power to redress wrongs, refuse to listen to the petitions that are sent to them; the men who, when they are asked for a loaf, give a stone. The honorable gentleman hates all rebels, he says. I wonder if he will extend his hatred to the great rebel whose proud statue stands almost at my arm's length. I venture to say that if that man whose statue has been erected here by the Canadian Government had been living to-day, and had occupied his place on the Treasury benches, he would have remembered that he was once a rebel. I have seen the day when the Minister of Militia had not for the rebellion the horror he now professes. I have seen the day when the Minister of Militia had not for rebels the deep hatred which he proclaimed to the world almost within the hearing of a condemned man; I have seen the day when the Minister of Militia had great sympathy in his heart for rebellion, when he had deep sympathy in his heart for the very rebel whom he had in his mind, and whose death-knell he was in advance ringing, when he was proclaiming his hatred of rebellion at Winnipeg. Riel was once before a rebel; he was indicted before, not for rebellion, but for murder connected with rebellion. The honorable gentleman who now has such a hatred for rebels spoke on that occasion. Resolutions were introduced in this House on a certain occasion to

EXTEND AN AMNESTY

for all offences connected with the rebellion and to all offenders, Riel and a few others excepted, and granting an amnesty even to them, but with certain restrictions. The honorable gentleman spoke on that occasion. Did he then proclaim, as he now does, his hatred of rebellion? Did he speak the language which

he spoke lately in Winnipeg? Did he say he hated all rebels? "I have a hatred of all rebels; I have no sympathy, good, bad or indifferent, with rebellion." No; but this is what he said:

Mr. Caron said that he will vote against the resolution because it does not afford a complete solution of the North-West difficulty. Having voted against the expulsion of Riel from this House, he cannot vote for his banishment from the country. A complete anmesty is the only practical solution, and he is sure that the same difficulties will recur next year.

Mr. Speaker, that was the sentiment of the honorable gentleman at that time. Well, if on that occasion Riel was entitled to a full amnesty, was he not entitled, at least, to a commutation of sentence on this occasion, when this last rebellion had not been darkened by such an act as darkened the pages of the first rebellion? The honorable gentleman in those days stated again and again that the first rebellion was justified. If the first rebellion was justified, was not the second rebellion equally justified? Where would be the half-breeds to-day if it had not been for this rebellion? Would they have obtained the rights which they now enjoy? I say, Sir, that the Canadian Government stands convicted of having yielded only to rebellion, and not to the just representations of the half-breeds, and of having actually forced them into insurrection. Mr. Speaker, such were my sentiments, and I spoke them elsewhere. I appeal, upon this occasion, as I did elsewhere,

TO EVERY FRIEND OF LIBERTY,

to all those who, during these twenty-five years past, have felt their hearts thrill whenever a struggle for freedom was going on in any corner of the world; with the Italians, when they delivered their country from the yoke of Austria; with the Americans, in their stupendous struggle for national unity and for

the suppression of African slavery; with the Mexicans, in their successful attempt to resist the foreign domination which the French Emperor sought to impose on them; with the French themselves in their generous though often misguided efforts to establish amongst themselves the bulwark of freedom, parliamentary and responsible government; with the Danubian populations, when they attempted to rid themselves of the degrading domination of the Turks; and when at last—at last—a section of our own countrymen rose in arms to claim rights long denied them, rights which were immediately acknowledged to be just, as soon as they were asked with bullets, are we to have no sympathy with them? Though, Mr. Speaker, these men were in the wrong; though the rebellion had to be put down; though it was the duty of the Canadian Government to assert its authority and vindicate the law; still, I ask any friend of liberty, if there is not a feeling rising in his heart, stronger than all reasoning to the contrary, that these men were excusable? Such were, Mr. Speaker, my sentiments. I spoke them elsewhere. I have had, since that time, occasion to realize that I have greatly shocked Tory editors and Tory members. Sir,

I KNOW WHAT TORY LOYALTY IS.

Tories have always been famous for preaching loyalty to others. Tories have always been famous for being loyal, as long as it was profitable to be so. Under the reign of James, the Tories were gushing in their loyalty as long as the tyranny of the king fell upon Whigs and Dissenters; but when at last the tyranny of James fell upon the Tories themselves and the Church of their heart, their slavish notions received a most salutary shock. They took side with the Whigs, and horror of horrors, they shouldered the musket, joined the Prince of Orange and put him on the throne; and I believe that to this day the Tories

will say that it was a happy day for England when that rebellion took place. If we pass from England to this country, we have the same tale to tell. In 1849 the Tories were gushing in their loyalty as long as they expected the Governor General to be disloyal to the people, but when they found the Governor General was loyal to the people, their own loyalty oozed out of their bodies and vanished into thin air. They did not shoulder the musket—that would have been too noble a weapon—but with eggs and stones they pelted the representative of Her Majesty. They did not shoulder the musket, but with pen and ink they wrote and signed annexation manifestoes. And, Mr. Speaker, if we continue the story, even down to the days since this Government has been in power, we find that when they introduced the National Policy, and when it was objected that that policy was unfair and ungenerous to England, and that it might possibly endanger British connection, the cool Tory answer was: "So much the worse for British connection." Sir, this is Tory loyalty. Ready they are to-day to sacrifice British connection, if British connection stands between them and their selfishness; ready they are to-day to sacrifice British connection if it stands between them and their enjoyment of power; ready they are to sacrifice British connection for mere sordid greed, but they affect, forsooth, to be shocked when we profess sympathy for men who, in the West, have been vindicating their rights long denied. Sir, I will not receive any lectures on loyalty from men with such a record. I am a British subject, and I value the proud title as much as any one in this House. But if it be expected of me that I shall allow fellow-countrymen unfriended, undefended, unprotected and unrepresented in this House, to be trampled under foot by this Government, I say that is not what I understand by loyalty, and I would call that slavery. I am a British subject, but my loyalty is not of the lips. If honorable gentlemen opposite will read history, they will find that my ancestors, in all their

struggles against the British Crown in the past, never sought anything else than

TO BE TREATED AS BRITISH SUBJECTS,

and as soon as they were treated as British subjects, though they had not forgotten the land of their ancestors, they became amongst the most loyal subjects that England ever had. Sir, since our loyalty has been impugned by honorable gentlemen opposite, I am inclined to quote the sentiments of my race and of my party, as they were expressed by my honorable friend from Megantic (Mr. Langelier) on an occasion which was not political. Last summer certain delegates from boards of trade in France visited Canada. They were entertained by the Corporation of Quebec which presented them an address, and the honorable member for Megantic, in his quality of Mayor, spoke as follows:

> The fate of arms has decreed that our political destinies should be united with the destinies of England, and when we consider all the advantages which we have reaped from that state of things, our regret at being separated from France is not without compensation. When we can establish with France extended commercial relations, nothing more shall we want. We preserve a political *regime* of which we are proud, and we obtain at the same time the satisfaction of preserving our interests and sentiments.

This is the loyalty of the French Canadians to-day. They are true to their ancestors. And who should object? We speak the French language, and if you look at it from a purely utilitarian point of view it is a great disadvantage, because we have afterwards to learn a foreign language to take our part in the national movement of this country. Every one must learn

TO SPEAK IT THE BEST HE CAN

in his own poor way. It would perhaps be best, from

a utilitarian point of view, to have only one language; but the French is the language of our mothers, the language which recalls to our minds the most sacred associations which first dawn on the heart of man and which can never die out, and so long as there are French mothers the language will not die. Yet these sentiments are quite consistent with our loyalty to England, and loyal we are to England; and if I were called to illustrate it, I could not do so better than by quoting the remark of a French Canadian lady to Mr. De Belvèze, who, in 1855, visited Canada by order of Napoleon III.: "Our hearts are with France, but our arms are to England." But loyalty must be reciprocal. It is not enough for the subject to be loyal to the Crown; the Crown must also be loyal to the subject. So far as England is concerned she has done her duty nobly, generously; but this Government has not done its duty towards the half-breeds. The Government are shocked, and their friends profess to be shocked, because those men claim their rights and demanded them with bullets. Have the Government been loyal to those half-breeds? If they had been loyal to the half-breeds, no such trouble would have occurred. If the Government do not respect the law themselves, and if afterwards men, to vindicate their rights, take weapons in their hands and brave the laws, I say the Government are bound to search their consciences and see if they have given occasion for rebellion, and if they have to give the benefit to the guilty ones. This is what we, in Lower Canada, have been claiming, and this is one of the reasons why we have felt so warmly on this question. Such is not, however, the doctrine of the Government.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE GOVERNMENT

is not put in that way in the memorandum which was issued some time after the execution of Louis Riel. Shortly after that execution the Government thought it proper, and I do not blame them for it, to put their

defence before the country. They did it in a very able paper signed by the late Minister of Justice, Sir Alexander Campbell. In the very first words he speaks as follows:

> The opponents of the Government have asserted that the rebellion was provoked, if not justified, by their mal-administration of the affairs of the North-West Territories and inattention to the just claims of the half-breeds. With this question, which has been made one of party politics, it is not thought becoming to deal here. Upon such a charge, when made in a constitutional manner, the Government will be responsible to the representatives of the people, and before them they will be prepared to meet and disprove it.

That the Government should be compelled to submit their reasons for having so acted goes as a matter of course. They were to give their reasons—they were responsible to the people. This is a matter of course. But this is not what is contended here. The contention laid down is that when the people of Canada are to examine the action of the Government in executing Riel, the question whether or not the rebellion was provoked is not to be taken into consideration. Was there ever a more unconstitutional, more intolerable doctrine propounded? I say it is contrary to the true doctrine, for if there is any occasion when the Government is bound to search into the matter to see if provocation has been given for the committal of an offence, which has involved the death penalty, it is when the offence charged is

PURELY A POLITICAL ONE.

It is always with regret I am sure, that the Minister of Justice finds himself unable to report in favor of the commutation of a death sentence. Whenever in this country a sentence of death is passed upon any of our fellow beings, it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to enquire into the causes of the crime in order to see if the requirements of the law would not

be equally met if the death sentence were not carried out. Nothing is left behind that can lead to that desired end. And yet we are told here that when a man is charged with a political crime, the Government are not to consider whether there was provocation or not by the Crown? With the Government all rebellions are alike, whether provoked or not, and they have all to be treated in the same way. You are to look at all rebellions as utterly bad. You have to look upon the rebellion of Junius Brutus and the attempted rebellion of Cataline as equally bad. I say, on the contrary, that this is one of the grounds on which I arraign the Government. It was their duty, when they came to consider whether the death sentence should be carried out on Riel, to consider whether he had received provocation for the deed which brought him into that situation; and having failed to do so, the Government, on their own confession, stand guilty of having failed in a duty, which is one of the most sacred that ever can fall upon man. The doctrine of the Government is so untenable that they could not adhere to it to the last. Even before Sir Alexander Campbell had reached the end of his factum, he abandoned his theory, for in the very bottom lines, he says:

> Whether rebellion alone should be punished with death is a question upon which opinions may differ. Treason will probably ever remain what it always has been among civilised nations, the highest of all crimes; but such conviction for that offence must be treated and disposed of by the Executive Government upon its own merits, and with a full consideration of all the attendant circumstances. In this particular instance, it was a second offence, and, as on the first occasion....

The ex-Minister of Justice commenced by saying that we should not look into the causes which had induced the rebellion; he had conveniently left aside looking into the causes, but he no less conveniently looked into the fact that this was a second offence. So it was, and for the second time the Government

WAS GUILTY OF THAT REBELLION;

for the second time Riel was a rebel, and was a rebel on account of the conduct of the present Government. Sir, I am not of those who look upon Louis Riel as a hero. Nature had endowed him with many brilliant qualities, but nature had denied him that supreme quality without which, all other qualities, however brilliant, are of no avail. Nature had denied him a well-balanced mind. At his worst he was a subject fit for an asylum, at his best he was a religious and political monomaniac. But he was not a bad man—I do not believe at least that he was the bad man that he has been represented to be in a certain press. It is true that at the trial a most damaging fact was brought against him; it is true that he had offered to accept a bribe from the Government. But justice to his memory requires that all the circumstances connected with the fact, should be laid before the House. If he accepted this money, it is evident that in his own confused mind it was not with a view of betraying the cause of his fellow countrymen—

Some honorable members:—Yes, yes.

Mr. Laurier:—Why, Mr. Speaker, I do not expect that the members who now interrupt me, would deal in the same manner, but, Sir, I give them the credit of having

BETTER BALANCED MINDS

than Louis Riel. In his own dazed mind it is evident that if he accepted the money, it was not with a view of betraying his follow countrymen—it was with the view of working for them in another way, since he said, he would start a paper in the United States and raise up the other nationalities.

An honorable member:—Another rebellion.

Mr. Laurier:—I grant that if that reasoning had been made by a man in his senses, such as an honorable gentleman on the other side, it would be enough

to stifle any sympathy we could have for him; but we must make due allowances for the fact that it is proved that if he was not actually insane, no man can deny that upon this subject of politics his mind was not right or sound; and of course in the case of a mind unsound or insane we cannot apply the same tests that we should apply to a reasonable mind—it would be unfair to do so. That he was insane, seems to me, however, beyond the possibility of controversy. When the reports first came here last spring and in the early summer, of his doings and sayings in the North-West, when we heard that he was to establish monarchies in the North-West, that he was to depose the Pope and establish an American Pope, those who did not know him believed he was an impostor, but those who knew him knew at once what was the matter with him. In the Province of Quebec there was not an instant's hesitation about it. Almost every man in that Province knew that he had been several times confined in asylums, and therefore it was manifest to the people of the Quebec that he had fallen into one of those misfortunes with which he was afflicted. When his counsel were engaged and commenced to prepare for his trial, they saw at once that if justice to him and only justice to him was to be done, their plea should be a plea of insanity. It has been said that the trial was a fair one. I deny it. I will not go over some of the arguments which have been put forward on this subject, but I ask the special attention of the House to this fact: This man asked for a month's delay for his trial; he obtained eight days. Was that justice?

WAS THAT BRITISH JUSTICE?

Was that giving fair play to the accused? When he swore that justice to his case demanded a delay of one month, could there be any public reason that militated against that demand? Could there be any public reason why such a request as that should not

have been granted? and yet it was refused. Again, when he asked for witnesses, was the request granted him? No, it was again refused. I again recall the attention of the House to the affidavit which Riel gave, that he wanted several witnesses, amongst others Gabriel Dumont and Michel Dumas and others. I grant at once that to bring Gabriel Dumont and Michel Dumas to this country, both of whom were fugitives from justice, was hardly possible; but remember that he asked as an alternative a thing which was perfectly feasible, and it was denied him. He asked this alternative under oath:

> That unless the Government of this country or this honorable court do provide the means with which to secure the attendance of the above-named witnesses before this court, it is essential to my defence that the various papers, writings and documents taken from me at the time of my surrender to General Middleton, and taken by him and his officers from my house subsequently, should be placed in the hands of my counsel for their examination and consideration, previous to being put upon my trial.

Sir, you see the treatment of the accused on that occasion; he asked one of two things. He said either procure me the attendance of certain witnesses, Gabriel Dumont and Michel Dumas and others, or if you cannot or will not do that, give to my counsel the papers taken from me at Batoche. Was there ever a more moderate or reasonable petition presented to a court of justice? When this man simply said: I do not ask those witnesses if you cannot give them to me, but there is one thing you can give to me: you can give me communication of my papers which were taken from me at Batoche.

WHY WERE THEY NOT GIVEN?

Reasons of State! Why, these papers have been moved for in this present session, and the Government granted the motion without any objection. There

could not, therefore, be any reason of State. True, they have not been brought down yet, but the reason of State which was invoked at the trial is not brought forward in this House, and why? Because such a reason would never have stood discussion in this public Parliament. Yet with this imperfect trial the jury recommended him to the mercy of the court. The Minister of Public Works said the other day that it was nothing unusual for juries to bring in verdicts with recommendation to mercy. No, it is not unusual, but what is very unusual is that the Government should give no heed to this recommendation. That was the unusual thing done on this occasion. After the trial was over, the conviction was so deeply seated in the minds of many friends of the Government that ample and full justice had not been done, that they at once petitioned the Government to issue a commission to examine the prisoner, to see

WHETHER HE WAS SANE OR INSANE

in mind. This petition was made, as I am informed, by friends of the Government, to the Government, again and again. The Government did not refuse, but treated it simply as the petitions of the half-breeds were treated—put off, put off, until the very week that preceded the execution. And then the commission—was it a commission? I do not know what kind of instructionswere given; that we do not know. But we do know that upon the 8th November, 1885, just a week before the execution, two medical gentlemen from the east were at Regina and examined the prisoner. Were those gentlemen sent to Regina with the object of advising the Government whether or not the sentence should be commuted? I say emphatically, no. I charge this against the Government again, that when they sent this so-called commision to Regina to examine the state of mind of Louis Riel, it was not with a view of determining the question whether the sentence should be carried out or com-

muted, but it was to throw dust in the eyes of the public and enable the Government to say afterwards, we have consulted specialists and they have reported in favor of sanity. But, Mr. Speaker, we have it on record that when this commission was sitting in Regina, when on the 6th, the 7th and the 8th of November, Dr. Lavell and Dr. Valade were examining Riel to see whether he was insane or not, at that time the Government, had determined to hang Riel; and this fact stands to the shame of the Government, perhaps more than anything else, because at that time they were simply playing a comedy. They were not acting with a view to justice; they were simply attempting to blindfold the people - to deceive the people. Why, Sir, the Order in council containing the decision of the Government was passed on the 12th of November, but long before that time the Government had come to their conclusion. The honorable Minister of Militia about that time made a trip to the North-West. He arrived at Winnipeg on the 7th or 8th of November, so that he must have left Ottawa about the 3rd or 4th or the 2nd of November; and before the honorable gentleman had left Ottawa for Winnipeg, the sentence, if not recorded, had been decided upon by the advisors of His Excellency. We have the

EVIDENCE OF THE PREMIER HIMSELF

as to that. Here is a letter which was sent by the honorable Prime Minister to the honorable Minister of Militia:

OTTAWA, 20th November, 1885.

MY DEAR CARON,

You say you are charged with having left Ottawa before the decision of the Governor in Council was arrived at with respect to Louis Riel, and as if for the purpose of avoiding being party to the decision.

This is not the case, the Council had come to the conclusion that it was necessary, in the interest of justice, that the

sentence should be allowed to be carried into effect, in your presence as a Member of the Council, before you left for Winnipeg.

Sir, we must give the Minister of Militia his due; he has had a full share in the hanging of Louis Riel; let him have what really appertains to him. Before he left Ottawa, the sentence had been decided between him and his colleagues. Let him have his full share of the merit, if merit there be, or the shame; let him have also his full share of the comedy which was afterwards played before the public. For, I ask it of any man in his senses—I ask it of any man on the Opposition benches; I ask it of any man in the country—was there ever a more

SHAMEFUL THING ENACTED BY A GOVERNMENT,

than after they had decided to execute, for the purpose of blinding the public, to send a commission to enquire whether the convict was insane or not? What was the object of enquiring whether he was insane or not, if the Government, at that time, had made up their minds and decided that he should be hanged? The object was to do what has since been done—to say to the people of Canada: We have consulted medical officers, and they have reported, and upon their report we have acted. Sir, it was not upon this report that they acted; this report was a false note, and they did not act upon it, because when they got it their decision had been arrived at; and upon this I arraign the Government of the country, not only as being guilty of a cruel act, but as being guilty of an attempt to deceive the people of this country. Sir, if the Government had been desirous of learning whether Riel was insane or sane, there was no need of sending a commission to examine him. It would have been sufficient to look at his history; it would have been sufficient even to look at his record in the rebellion. We have it now as a fact of history that while Riel was

inducing that rebellion, he chose as his chief adviser and secretary, a man notoriously insane, William Joseph Jackson, who signed his letters and Orders in Council. Will it be pretended by any man that if Riel had been in his senses, if he had had a sane and discerning mind, he would have accepted an insane man as his chief adviser? Why did this not strike honorable gentlemen opposite? One of the things which we in Lower Canada have felt a deeply as we have ever felt anything, is that we have believed that the measure of justice which was extended to Louis Riel

WAS NOT THE SAME MEASURE OF JUSTICE

which was extended to William Joseph Jackson. Jackson was put upon his trial, and I am bound to say this, in duty to the Crown presecutors, that upon that occasion they did their duty. They acknowledged at once the insanity of the prisoner and directed an acquittal. The trial of Jackson took place on the 26th of July last. Mr. Osler, counsel for the Crown, in opening the case, spoke as follows:—

The prisoner is charged with having participated in the recent rebellion, with having acted in the capacity of private secretary to Louis Riel, the leader of the rebellion. He is charged here now formally with this crime, but it is understood that the counsel for the prisoner, Mr. McArthur, will be able to give you satisfactory evidence of the insanity of the prisoner, and that he is not really responsible, and was not responsible for the acts committed by him. The Crown do not propose to contest that contention on the part of prisoner's counsel. The evidence, in fact, comes from the medical men who have examined the prisoner on the part of the Crown, and evidence that has come to the knowledge of counsel for the Crown, during the course of preparation for other trials, is conclusive that, at the time he committed the acts, he was not responsible for them.

Now, Sir, it is important to look at the evidence which was adduced on that occasion. Dr. Jukes was examined:—

By Mr. Osler—Q. Is he so insane that it would be unfair to say he was not responsible for his acts?

A.—There are occasions when I would consider he would be quite responsible; to-day he spoke and reasoned with me in a manner that was very clear, but only three days ago he was crazed. His mind seems to be dazed. I do not think that, to bring him at a moment's notice, he would be capable of conducting his trial, or of doing justice to himself in any manner.

Q.—To a considerable extent, your opinion is, that he could not control his actions?

A.—I have never seen anything about him to give me the impression that his actions were uncontrollable. It is rather his mental hallucinations, his ideas. He holds peculiar ideas on religious matters in connection with this trouble, and in connection with the new religion of which he thinks that Louis Riel is the founder, and which he thinks it is his duty to sustain.

Q.—Would this be consistent with his committing crime?

A.—If he spoke rationally I would think so, but he does not.

Q.—Then you would not hold him responsible for acts done in connection with these ideas?

A.—If he committed any acts in the condition he is now, I would not hold him responsible. The slightest excitement produces a great effect upon him.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask

ANY FAIR-MINDED MAN,

if this applies to William Joseph Jackson, would not every line of it apply equally to Louis Riel? Is it not a fact that these two men were deluded on the same subjects? Jackson spoke rationally, but he had hallucinations, just as Riel had; and yet one of these men is acquitted, is sent to an asylum, and is then allowed to escape, while Louis Riel is sent to the gallows. Jackson is free to-day, and Riel is in his grave. I therefore cannot come to any other conclusion than that upon this occasion the same measure of justice which was extended to one man was not extended to the other. I do not want to raise national prejudices, but prejudices are not always the out-growth of ignoble passion; sometimes they are simply the out-

growth of a noble passion; national prejudices may be the out-growth of national pride, and when the people of Lower-Canada found that the one prisoner was treated in one way and the other in a different way, there was occasion, at least, why they should feel as they did upon this matter. But we never knew, until the Minister of Public Works spoke the other day, what was the true reason of the execution of Riel. We have it now; he has spoken and we know what was the true inwardness of it. The Government had written a pamphlet in order to justify themselves. The utility of that pamphlet is gone; it never had any; not one of the reasons it gave for the execution of Riel was the true reason. It never had any usefulness at all, except, perhaps as affording to the Government job printing to

SETTLE THE WAVERING CONSCIENCES

of some of their followers. But now we know the true reason why Riel was executed, and here it is in the language of the Minister of Public Works:

> We had this before us, we had the fact that Louis Riel had, fifteen years before this, committed an act which was considered at the time one that should have been punished in the most severe way. The prisoner, Louis Riel, at that time was not condemned to a severe punishment; he was allowed to remain out of the country for five years, and he was not brought before a tribunal to be tried, and punished or absolved, for the death of Thomas Scott.

Here is the reason—the death of Thomas Scott Since I have named Thomas Scott, let me pause a moment. The Minister of Public Works said the other day that those who sympathised with Riel could not condemn the Government for his execution, because they excused him for the execution of Scott, and the only defence made in his favor was that the act was done by a *de facto* government. This was not the true raison. Whether the government of Riel was a *de facto*

government or not, is a question upon which there may be considerable difference of opinion. The death of Scott has not been prosecuted for other reasons, to which I shall come presently, but since I have spoken of the death of Scott, I must say that I have always held the view that it was one of the most painful tragedies that has ever occurred in the life of any country; it was one of those acts for which there could be no possible excuse, unless the excuse we now have, that the man's mind was unsound. I cannot conceive

THAT ANY ONE OF SOUND MIND

could have committed so crual an act. Whether the death of Scott was the act of a *de facto* government or not, does not matter. *De facto* governments are sometimes guilty of judicial murders, as we know to-day. Whether the act of Riel was the act of a *de facto* Government or not, if that man had been responsible for his acts, as gentlemen on the Treasury benches are responsible for theirs, then the execution of Scott would be a stain on the memory of Riel, just as the execution of the Duke d'Enghien is a stain on the memory of Napoléon, as the execution of Louis XVI is a stain on the records of the French Convention, as the execution of Admiral Byng is a stain on the English Government of that day, as the execution of Mary Stuart is a stain on the memory of Queen Elizabeth, and as the execution of Riel will be a permanent stain and shame on the present Government. The death of Scott is the cause of the death of Riel to-day! Why, if the hon. gentleman thinks that the death of Scott was a crime, did he not punish Riel at the time? Scott was executed in the early days of 1870, the Government remained in power until the fall of 1873, yet they never did anything to bring that man to justice, who had committed such a crime as they say now he committed. 1870-71-72-73, almost four full years, passed away, and yet the Government, knowing such a crime as it has been represented here

had been committed, never took any step to have the crime punished. What was their reason? The reason was that the Government had promised to condone the offence; the reason was that the Government were not willing to let that man come to trial, but on the contrary, actually supplied him with money to induce him to leave the country, and, Sir, I ask any man on the other side of the House, if this offence was punishable, why was it not punished then? And if it was not punishable then, why should it be punished now? The language of the hon. gentleman is obvious, it is plain, it is transparent, it was spoken by the Minister of Militia, who showed that this offence

SHOULD HAVE BEEN FULLY PARDONED

at the time. Well, if the offence was to be fully pardoned at the time, is it fair to bring it as a charge against the offender now? Is it now fair to base a condemnation of death against him, upon it? Sir, I say it is one of the greatest mistakes—not a mistake alone, but one of the gravest wrongs against the rights of mankind that ever was perpetrated by any Government. Yet I must say I was not altogether surprised at the language of the hon. Minister of Public Works. We had heard something of that before. The Secretary of State visited his county in the month of January, and he also spoke of this event and the execution of Louis Riel. The Minister of Public Works would not meet his accusers except upon the floor of Parliament. The Secretary of State did not object to meet the people, but not his accusers. Still, he went to Terrebonne, and here is the manner in which he spoke of the death of Scott:

I have my symyathies for the half-breeds, and I have proved it; I have proved it before to-day. In 1874, when Ambroise Lépine was accused of murder, I travelled over 2,000 miles to defend him. I did not go round passing my hat for subscription to pay me for defending the accused. I did it

manfully, without any hope of reward. (Cheers.) The insurrection of 1870 had a color of an excuse. Men higher than I am in politics have gone so for as to say that there was justification for the rebellion of that day. It was the assertion of the rights of nationality against the cession of territory by supreme power. I defended my client and during that defence I had proof, and the best proof, too, that the killing of the unfortunate Scott was one of the most atrocious murders ever committed. That atrocious murder was without the connivance and without the approval of Lépine, but it was the result of the selfish vengeance of the then dictator of the North-West —Louis Riel.

SUCH WAS THE LANGUAGE

spoken by the honorable gentleman on that occasion. He was speaking something like ten years after he had gone to the North-West to defend Ambroise Lépine, and after he had acquired that knowledge which enabled him to say that the murder of Scott was one of the most atrocious murders ever committed. Yet, scarcely a few weeks after his return from Winnipeg, where he had defended Lépine, the honorable gentleman moved in the Legislature of Quebec, a resolution, in which he thus characterises the act which he now represents as one of the most atrocious murders ever committed:

The troubles in the settlement of the Red River, now the Province of Manitoba, in 1866-70, unfortunately produced a conflict of such a nature as to develop into a rising of considerable magnitude. The leaders of that movement then constituted themselves into a government, and one act to be deplored, perpetrated under the assumed authority of that government, was the execution of one of the subjects of Her Majesty. * * * * While bowing to the verdict rendered against one of the actors in the movement above mentioned, public opinion in that remote Province of Manitoba, as well as in other Provinces of the Dominion, and even in England, has been strongly impressed with the idea that the deplorable act of violence is so interwoven with the political events of that unhappy period as to render it impossible to assimilate it to ordinary cases of murder. * * * With the view of satis-

fying such sentiment of clemency, and of realizing the ideas of conciliation, peace and tranquility, which presided over the establishment of the Confederation, and further with the view of removing all causes of divisions and hostile sentiments from among the various nationalities of the country, and especially with the view of giving effect to the recommendation to mercy which the jury coupled with their verdict, your Excellency is humbly prayed to be pleased to exercise, in favor of Ambroise Lépine, now under sentence, the royal prerogative of mercy, by extending to him grace and pardon.

Now, if in 1874, the honorable gentleman, just fresh from Winnipeg, where he had just defended Lépine, represented this act as one "so interwoven with the political events of that unhappy period as to render it impossible to assimilate it to ordinary cases of murder," in order to obtain the life of one man, is it fair and just now to represent the same act as an atrocious murder in order to take the life of another man? Sir, this issue of the death of Scott

HAS LONG BEEN A BURIED ISSUE,

and it should not have been brought up again for political consideration. There was a time when it was a living issue, too living an issue. before the people of this country. When the administration of my honorable friend the member for East-York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power, that had been for years a living, burning issue before the public. Scott had been executed in the early days of 1870. An amnesty had been promised by the men who now sit on the Treasury benches, but they never had the courage to carry it out; they never had the courage to stand by their word and deal to the offenders in that rebellion, what they had promised to them. They allowed years and years to pass, and, in the meantime, passions were getting more and more bitter. There are prejudices in Ontario, and there are prejudices in Quebec, and upon such a question the people of Ontario took one view and the people of Quebec took

the other view. The people of Ontario demanded that the law should take its course; the people of Quebec demanded that the promises of the Government should be carried out; and between the two provinces the government had not the courage to do anything, and they allowed this bitterness of feeling to grow until it became a public danger, which they had not the courage to face. But when the government of my honorable friend the member for East-York came into power, they grappled with the difficulty and settled it in a way which must ever be a credit to them. They asked their followers from Ontario and from Quebec each to give up a certain portion of their pretentions for the common weal, each to sacrifice upon the altar of their country something of their preventions and to unite upon a common course; and upon that they united and the result has been what was stated by the honorable member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault),

THAT AT LAST PEACE PREVAILED

which had been unknown for many long years. This issue of the death of Thomas Scott has been long dead and now it is raised by whom? It is raised by members opposite—the last men who should ever speak of it. Sir, we are a new nation, we are attempting to unite the different conflicting elements which we have into a nation. Shall we ever succeed if the Bond of Union is to be revenge, if we are to rake up the old sores and launch them at the heads of one another? I am sorry that the Government upon this occasion did not take a leaf from the book of our friends to the south of us. After the civil war was over, there were men who, when they then fully learnt of the outrages at the Andersonville prison and other places, demanded that, if an amnesty was given to political offenders, at least those who were guilty of those outrages should be brought to justice; but not a drop of blood was shed, not a trial was had, and it is manifest to-day

that the nation is the greater for it. I am sorry also that the Government did not take another leaf from the book of the American nation. I believe

THERE WAS A REASON

—a reason adequate to my mind, at least—why they should have granted, if not an amnesty—I do not say that - at all events a commutation of sentence. On the 13th May, the day after the battle of Batoche, General Middleton, the commander of forces, wrote as follows to Louis Riel:

> MR. RIEL,—I am ready to receive you and your council, and to protect you until your cause has been decided upon by the Canadian Government.
>
> FRED. MIDDLETON.

Riel surrendered. Did he or did he not surrender in virtue of that letter, of that invitation of General Middleton? On that point there can be no better evidence than that of General Middleton himself:

> May, 15th.—I sent out parties of mounted men, under Major Boulton, to scour the woods. In the afternoon two scouts—Armstrong and Hourie—who had been sent out with Boulton, and had moved away by themselves, came upon Riel, who gave himself up, producing my letter to him, in which I summoned him to surrender and promised to protect him until his case was considered by the Canadian Government.

Sir, is there not evidence here that Riel then surrendered by virtue of the invitation given by General Middleton? If such is the case, then I submit it to any man's sense of justice and honor if the Canadian Government were justified afterwards in executing a man, their prisoner upon their own invitation? It may be that legally speaking Riel could not bring this as a bar in his trial to any indictment against him, but it seems to me that it is repugnant to any one's sense of honor and justice that a man whom you have

invited to become your prisoner in order to avoid the death of a soldier upon the battlefield, should afterwards be hanged to a gibbet.

THE LETTER OF GENERAL MIDDLETON

was undoubtedly dictated by the most humane sentiments and not only that, but it is evident also that the course was politic. We see by the report of the General that, after the capture of Batoche, one of his objects was the capture of Riel. As long as Riel was in the field the rebellion was not ended, and there was a possibility that he might organise guerilla bands, and more lives and treasure would have to be spent before the rebellion was suppressed. The General states in his report :

> May, 14th.—We marched for Lepine's Crossing. Having halted for dinner, I received information that Riel was somewhere in the vicinity, so determined to make for Guardapui, or Short's Crossing, which was some miles nearer,and camp for the night.

You see the General is obliged to alter his course, because Riel is in a certain direction which he had not anticipated. Then when Riel surrendered, the least the Government could do, was not to treat him as they would have done if he had been taken on the field of battle. We have in this matter the precedent of General Lee and General Grant. On the 2nd April, 1865, Richmond, which had so long withstood the Union forces, surrendered, and General Lee commenced his retreat with the object of joining his forces with those of General Johnston. He was followed closely by the victorious army, and, on the 7th of April, General Grant sent him a letter, not inviting, but simply suggesting to him to surrender. General Lee refused, and continued to fight; but, two days afterwards, finding that his situation was hopeless, he sought a conference with General Grant, and ac-

cepted the invitation to surrender. General Grant dictated his terms, and here they are :

APPOMATTOX COURT HOUSE, VIRGINIA,

9th April, 1865.

GENERAL.—In accordance with the substance of my letter to you of the 8th instant, I propose to receive the surrender of the army of Northern Virginia on the following terms, to wit : Rolls of all the officers and men to be made in duplicate, one copy to be given by an officer designated by me, the other to be retained by such officer or officers as you may designate. The officers to give their individual paroles not to take up arms against the Government of the United States until properly exchanged, and each company or regimental commander to sign a like parole for the men of his command. The arms, artillery and public property to be packed and stacked, and turned over to the officers appointed by me to receive them. This will not embrace the side arms of the officers. nor their private horses or baggage. This done, each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home, not to be disturbed by the United States authority so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they may reside.

U. S. GRANT.

General R. C. Lee.

There you see that the surrendered army were paroled. They were not confined, but allowed to go at liberty so long as as they did not take up arms again and violate the laws of the United States; but some authorities in the United States held that this did not prevent the Government from prosecuting the leaders for treason; for guilty of treason they certainly were. The new President of the United States, Andrew Johnson, took steps to bring General Lee, and several of the most prominent officers to trial. This was steadily opposed by General Grant. The magnanimity of General Grant's character then came out, and he threatened to resign his position in the army if General Lee and the other prisoners of war were tried for treason. A few months afterwards a committee of

Congress sat upon the question. General Grant was brought before the committee and gave this evidence :

I frequently had to intercede for General Lee and other paroled officers, on the ground that their parole, so long as they observed the laws of the United States, protected them from arrest and trial. The President, at that time occupied exactly the reverse grounds, viz. : that they should be tried and punished. He wanted to know when the time would come when they would be punished. I told him not so long as they obeyed the law and complied with the stipulation.

Eldridge—You looked on that in the nature of a parole, and held that they could only be tried when they violated that parole.

Grant.—Yes,that is the view I took of the question.

Eldridge:—Did you consider that that applied to Jefferson Davis ?

Grant:—No, Sir, he did not take any parole. It applied to no person who was captured—only to these who were paroled.

Eldridge:—Did the President insist that General Lee should be tried for treason ?

Grant:—He contended for it.....I insisted that General Lee would not have surrendered his army, or given up their arms, if he had supposed that after surrender, he was going to be tried for treason and hanged.

Now, is it not manifest, as was stated by the honorable member for West Huron the other night, that if Riel had supposed that in surrendering he would meet with the same fate as if he was taken prisoner, he would never have surrendered, but would have done as Gabriel Dumont and several others did ? Recurring to the American case, who can doubt that of those two men, Andrew Johnson and General Grant, the true statesman, the true patriot, was the one who advocated clemency ? You see the result to-day. Scarcely twenty years have passed away since that rebellion, the most terrible that ever shook a civilised nation, was put down, and because of the merciful course adopted by the victors, the two sections of that country are now more closely united than ever before, more closely even than they were when fight-

ing for their independence. The Canadian Government

SHOULD HAVE FOLLOWED THIS EXAMPLE,

and I repeat again that we cannot make a nation of this new country by shedding blood, but only by extending mercy and charity for all political offences. The Government say they were desirous of giving a lesson. In the last paragraph of their written defence, they say :

> In deciding for the application for the commutation of sentence passed upon the prisoner the Government were obliged to keep in view the need of exemplary and deterrent punishment committed in a country situated in regard to settlement and population as are the North-West Territories; the isolation and defenceless position of the settlers already there; the horrors to which they have been exposed in the event of an Indian outbreak; the effect upon intending settlers of any weakness in the administration of law, and the consequences which must follow such a course in a country if it came to be believed that such crimes as Riel's could be committed without incurring the extreme penalty of the law, by any one who was either subject to delusions, or could lead people to believe he was so subject.

Indeed the Government have convinced all the people here mentioned, the half-breeds, the Indians, the white settlers, that their arm is long and strong, and that they are powerful to punish. Would to heaven that they had taken as much pains to convince them all, the half-breeds, Indians and white settlers, of their desire and their willingness to do them justice, to treat them fairly. Had they taken as much pains to do right, as they have taken to punish wrong, they never would have had any occasion to convince those people, that the law cannot be violated with impunity, because the law would never have been violated at all. But to-day, not to speak of those who have lost their lives,

OUR PRISONS ARE FULL OF MEN

who, despairing ever to get justice by peace, sought to obtain it by war, who, despairing of ever being treated like freemen, took their lives in their hands, rather than be treated as slaves. They have suffered a great deal, they are suffering still; yet, their sacrifices will not be without reward. Their leader is in the grave; they are in durance, but from their prisons they can see that

THAT JUSTICE, THAT LIBERTY

which they sought in vain, and for which they fought not in vain, has at last dawned upon their country. Their fate well illustrates the truth of Byron's invocation to liberty, in the introduction to the Prisoner of Chillon :—

> Eternal Spirit of the chainless mind!
> Brightest in dungeons, Liberty thou art!
> For there thy habitation is the heart—
> The heart which love of thee alone can bind;
> And when thy sons to fetters are consigned—
> To fetters and the damp vault's dayless gloom,
> Their country conquers with their martyrdom.

Yes, their country has conquered with their martyrdom. They are in durance to-day; but the rights for which they were fighting have been acknowledged. We have not the report of the commission yet, but we know that more than two thousand claims so long denied have been at last granted. And more—still more. We have it in the Speech from the Throne that at last representation is to be granted to those Territories. This side of the House long sought, but sought in vain, to obtain that measure of justice. It could not come then, but it came after the war; it came as the last conquest of that insurrection. And again I say that their country has conquered with their martyrdom, and if we look at that one fact alone there was cause sufficient, independent of all others, to extend mercy to the one who is dead and to those who live.

MR. LAURIER AT TORONTO

THE GRIEVANCES OF THE HALF-BREEDS AND RIEL'S EXECUTION

A COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION

TRE SAME LANGUAGE AT QUEBEC AND AT TORONTO

A SPLENDID TRIUMPH OVER PREJUDICE AND SLANDER

Mr. Laurier's adversaries having boasted that he would not dare to repeat before the people of Ontario the language he had held in his own province relative to the Half-Breed rebellion, he seized the first opportunity to take up the challenge. Accepting with honorable Mr. Blake the invitation extended to him by the Young Men's Liberal Club of Toronto, he there delivered, on the 10th December 1886, the following speech, an excellent report of which was published by the *Globe* next day. The two Liberal leaders spoke to a crowded house in the Horticultural Pavilion, the gathering being so large that many could not obtain admission. The chair was taken by Mr. W. D. Gregory, President of the Club, with Mr. Laurier on his right and Mr. Blake on his left, and among the other gentlemen on the platform were Messrs A. A. Marsh, B. B. Hughes, A. F. Chamberland, Patrick Hughes, W. A. Douglass, P. B. Casgrain M.P.,

hon. W. McMaster, Joseph Kilgour, H. H. Dewart, first Vice-President of the young Liberal Club; J. H. Gilmore, Treasurer of the Club; Capt Snelgroove, editor of the *Cobourg World;* John Dryman, Adam R. Greelman, J. F. Edgar, M. P., H. B. Manley, N. C. Love, George W. Keely, G. W. Badgerow, Alex. Boyd, D. Carlyle, R. B. Hamilton, John Leys, Rev. John J. Shea, Henry Swan, H. Laforce, and R. A. Dickson. Every class of Toronto's population was represented in the audience, which also included large numbers of Tories, but, as remarked by the *Globe,* the orators' arguments were so convincing and their logic so irresistible, that the only marks of disapproval were a few scattering protests from individuals, which were immediately silenced by the cheers of the crowd. Mr. Laurier spoke as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN,
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.

It is ever with a sense of diffidence that I rise to address an English-speaking audience. I ever feel and realize the great disadvantage of having to make use of a language which is not my own native language. This impresses me now—now especially as I am glad of the honor of addressing an audience of the city of Toronto—of a great city which, by common consent, is awarded the palm for intellectual culture in Canada. Yet these considerations, ladies and gentlemen, I lay aside, however only for the great question, the momentous issue, on which perhaps the few words I have to speak might suggest something to you. The fact that a Canadian now comes before you whose mother tongue is not the English tongue, but one whose pride springs sharply up in love for our nation, is an ever important fact especially when there are in Canada fully, at this moment, one million and a half of Her Majesty's subjects who in their language and other characteristics materially differ from the rest of the population. Up to a recent date this fact had never been given with other reference than a reference of courteous fellowship, and a mutual feeling pervaded in certain quarters where the language was of a very different description. For several

months past the press of this province, the Tory press of this province, and especially of this city, has been assiduously sending the impression abroad, and time and again making the assertion, that there is in the whole French race of Canada an ever fermenting element of rebellion; that the whole French race are not loyal to the constitution of this country; that they will not submit to the duties of citizenship except in so far as they tally with their interests and prejudices; and if I am allowed, and I think I will be on this occasion, I will refer to my own individual standing when I am represented day after day

AS A TRAITOR AND A REBEL.

I am here this evening; my chief object in coming here to this city of Toronto was to meet those accusations,and meet them in the face of the people to whom they are daily addressed.And I am thankful to you, Mr. Chairman; and I thank also the Young Liberals of Toronto for giving me the opportunity, which I now shall avail myself of, of meeting these charges and repelling them, as I hope, and I am sure I will repel them to your satisfaction.

There are several topics of great interest in which we are all interested, and on which I would like to address you. I am a French Canadian but above all, I am a Canadian, and there are common interests upon which we have the same feeling, but I hope that upon this occasion I shall be permitted chiefly to devote myself to the task of repelling these charges. It is always easy, gentlemen. to make charges. It is always an easy thing to raise prejudices, but I would challenge any man to bring forward anything, either word or fact, which would tend to show that since the year 1841 the French Canadians have not been the most loyal subjects that England ever had. But before I proceed one single step further, let me ask who are the traducers? Who are they who now profess to be shocked and alarmed at this alleged dis-

loyalty of the French Canadians? Who are they? Why, they are the men, the very men, whose party for thirty long years, with scarcely an exception, has been kept in power by the votes of the very men whom they now hold up to the execration of their fellow subjects. It is a matter of history that since the year 1855 up to a few years ago the great mass of the French Canadians have been almost unanimous in their support of the Conservative party. It is a matter of history that for almost the whole of that long period of time the Conservative party

HAS BEEN KEPT IN POWER

by the votes of the French Canadians. It is a matter of history that for the greater part of this period, the Conservative party was led in Lower Canada, without any objection from Ontario Tories so far as I know, by a man whose memory I respect, Sir George E. Cartier, who at one time was a rebel actually in arms against the Crown of England. It is a matter of history that during that time the Roman Catholic Church gave ostensible and most efficient support to the Conservative party, and it is also a matter of history that during all that time, so long as the French Canadians continued solid to keep the Tory party in power, the Ontario Tories never found any fault with the French Canadians; they never saw any danger in the power of the Church. They enjoyed power and all the benefit of power, they enjoyed it for all it was worth and more than it was worth, and the tender, delicate, sensitive Tory conscience never exposed to the outside world any trace of the alarms which, no doubt, judging from the tone of their press, they always felt. Their press was very different in tone from what it is to-day. It was then every day redolent with the most fulsome praise of the Church and of the French Canadian people. They wrote column upon column to prove that the French Canadians were a very good people. They issued certain circulars to be shown

only to certain electors to prove that the Tory party were the true sons of the Church, but as soon as the French Canadians undertook to divide, and so put the Tory Government in danger,

THEY CHANGED THEIR TACTICS

and bitterly attacked both the race and their Church, which before they had been supporting and flattering. What was the cause? What was the motive? It was perfectly transparent. The motive is ever the same, the motive of the attack and the motive of the adulation. It is to retain power, and the tactics are the same. The sudden appeal to prejudice is of the same kind and the same character.

Yesterday in order to retain power these men pandered to the prejudices of my fellow-countrymen in Canada. To-day when they see that, notwithstanding all that, the votes are now escaping them, they turn in another direction and pander to what prejudice they suppose may exist in this province. Well, gentlemen, let me go a step further and say that if to-morrow my countrymen were again to unite in support of the Government you would find them as active in fawning upon them as ever. You would find them as sly as mice, and with teeth as sharp to pick the crumbs of office, and not a word more would you hear of the power of the Church, and the so-called disloyalty of the French Canadians. Gentlemen, I am free to admit this, and without any restriction, that previous to the year 1841, that is, to the granting of responsible government to the people of this country, every man of the race to which I belong was a rebel, either in arms or in heart. But does it follow, because our fathers were rebels, that their sons should harbor treason in their hearts? I am sure there must be in this audience an appreciation of the sentiments of those gallant Highlanders who fought by the side of Prince Charlie at Culloden, against the British flag, which even then floated in almost all the lands of the

earth. It is to the testimony of that hour that I appeal. Their course, after the rebellion was over, is a living witness of the fact that

THE MOST FERVENT LOYALTY

can take the place of sullenness, and even rebellion. What was true, gentlemen, of the Scotch Highlanders, is true also of my fellow-countrymen, the French race in this country. The difference is that the Scotch Highlanders fought for a sentiment, and my French fellow-countrymen fought for a principle. But before they rebelled against the Crown of England they had proved their loyalty to that country in more manners than one. It is a matter of history that as soon as the great contest between Montcalm and Wolfe had been decided in favor of Wolfe, the French Canadians accepted unreservedly the state of things and became loyal British subjects and twice in succession during the course of a few short years their loyalty was put to the test, and in what were they found wanting? The country was invaded twice by the Americans, and twice they were repelled, the French Canadians fighting as nobly to accomplish this as any British subjects of the time could have done. They repelled all the blandishments of the emissaries of the French Government in order to induce them to cast off British rule and throw in their lot with the American people. Why did they rebel?

History is a witness of all their struggles against the British Crown. The only things they asked for were the rights of British subjects; and as soon as those rights were granted them—I repeat what I said before—they became what they are to-day, the most loyal subjects that England ever had. Sir, the attachment to British institutions is natural to men of your origin. It is

A MATTER OF TRADITION

o you. It must be so, because your very nature is

permeated with the associations and memories of the old land. Our attachment to the British Crown springs from another cause. Your attachment to the British Crown flows in your blood. With us our attachment to the British Crown springs from gratitude, it springs from the heart. We have learned to love British institutions because in British institutions we have found more freedom that we would ever had, had we remained the subjects of France, and how many times in that grand old city which I have the honour to represent, looking at the banner of St. George waving over her proud citadel, how many times have I said to myself that that flag represented the defeat of my countrymen, my ancestors, but at the same time recalled the thought that it was the flag the most precious to the human race, the flag of liberty. It may be that the Tories will not appreciate the sentiments which I now speak—(several cries of "Hear, hear")—and I see that there are Tories in this audience who may believe me insincere when I speak thus; but it is not to the cool, calculating Tory that I appeal. I appeal to the Liberals. They will understand that freedom has made England dear to our hearts and has made us forever loyal to her cause. There is one reproach which is made to us. We are reproached with having kept our individuality as a race. It is said that we are wanting in loyalty because we kept our individuality as a race. I fail to see the justice of the reproach. I admit that we retain our language, our religion, and our characteristics, but I cannot see the justice of the reproach, and more, it seems to me that we would not have been worthy of any esteem or of the name of French Canadians if we had not kept sacred the memories of our forefathers; so, I repeat,

I LOVE ENGLAND.

I honor and esteem English institutions; I do not regret that we are now subjects of the Queen instead of France; but may my right hand wither by my

side,if the memories of my forefathers ever cease to be dear to my heart ! It has been said also that the English privileges and liberties have been encroached up on ; that we want to put forward our own institutions and our language. I do not admit that reproach. It cannot be said of me that I want to do this, and I suppose I am one of the greatest sinners. I am said to be so, anyway, by the Tory papers In answer to this charge I cannot do better than to eefer to a speech which I made in the month of May 1884 at the Club National in Montreal, a society composed, as you probably know, of students. I spoke of the House of Commons at Ottawa, and of the procedure there, and I spoke as follows :—" What I have told you will show that the House of Commons, though there are about 50 French members, is exclusively an English assembly. The French language is the official language as is the English, but it is impossible to follow the speakers in the debates unless you speak the language of the majority. The remainder of the extract went to show that the French were an artistic people, and the force of circumstances in America was such that the English language was destined to become the most universal.

You see, gentlemen, this is the extent of my imputation I fully admit that the English language is bound to be the language of this country,and no man in his senses will deny it. For I simply confine myself to say that we are the French race and have certain duties,and have to fulfil those duties and nothing more. Certainly there is nothing in this to which any Canadian can take exception. I will say this, that we are Canadians. Below the island of Montreal the water that comes from the north from Ottawa unites with the waters that come from the western lakes,

BUT UNITING THEY DO NOT MIX.

There they run parallel, separate, distinguishable, and yet are one stream, flowing within the same banks,

the mighty St. Lawrence, and rolling on toward the sea bearing the commerce of a nation upon its bosom —a perfect image of our nation. We may not assimilate, we may not blend, but for all that we are the component parts of the same country. We may be French in our origin—and I do not deny my origin—I admit that I pride myself on it. We may be English, or Scotch or whatever it may be, but we are Canadians; one in aim and purpose; and not only Canadians, but we are also members of the same British Empire. This fact, that we are all Canadians, one in our objects, members of the British Empire, proud of being British subjects and Canadian, is evidence that we can keep pride of race without any detriment to the nation. As Canadians, we have feelings in common with each other that are not shared by our fellow-countrymen on the other side of the water. As Canadians, we are affected by local and national considerations, which bind us together and so we are led to look back to the land of our ancestors and feel, with all that, to be no less good Canadians.

THESE ARE THE FEELINGS

of the race to which I belong, and on this question I am true to my race, I am true to Canada. I am true to England, and last, and for this, I have often been reproached with being a traitor. I am above all true to the cause of liberty and justice. Sir, I am of French origin and have the pride of my race; in politics I am an English Liberal. The principles which I profess, such as they are, are the outgrowth of study and reflection, and did not come to me from the land of my ancestors. They came to me from England, from the great mother of modern liberty. I belong to the school of those men who fill the pages of English history, who always faced the great to get the right. I belong to the school of Hampden, and Pym, of Russell and Somers, and of Burke. And of one who did not hesitate, we read, on one occasion to say to the

Ministers of the Crown that they had not behaved as they should have towards the Colonies which were then in rebellion and to say that they had provoked that rebellion, just as the Ministers at another time since have provoked a rebellion. I am not a traitor though Tories may howl, but I say that no Government shall ever trample over my living body. As long as I have the breath of life in me, as long especially as I have a seat in Parliament, if the rights of men are trampled upon, be they French, Celtic, or Anglo-saxons, I would defend their cause with all the strength of my being. I am conscious that I could not do this alone; but this I could and I would do, in the face and in defiance of all opposing clamour, I would call upon the people of this country to stand

BY THE OPPRESSED AGAINST THE OPPRESSOR.

At this juncture someone in the audience began interrupting and someone cried—"Put him out."

Mr. Laurier:—Oh, no no, do not put him out, let him stay and hear; I am coming to the part that may tickle some of the Tories who may be in this audience, and I must say that as I respect all opinions I cannot hope the views I have to express will be those of every one in this audience, but let us try to have a friendly discussion, if possible; British fair play is all I ask. I come here to defend myself against certain allegations, and in the name of justice let those who have listened to the attack also listen to the answer. I repeat, Sir, I am not a traitor. I am not a preacher of rebellion. There has been lately, as you are aware, a rebellion in the North-West, and though the men who rebelled committed a great error; though, as I said, on many occasions, they had to be shot in battle, though they had to be conquered, I repeat before this great audience that in my opinion the guilt of the rebellion does not rest with the miserable wretches who took up arms, but rests altogether with the Gov-

ernment who provoked it. I cannot hope to be approved by everybody, but I address myself to every Englishman, not only in name, but who has a British heart in his bosom, is there a man who is prepared to condemn rebellion simply because it is rebellion? Is it not a fact that the history of England is full of rebellions? There is not a race on earth which has done as much for the cause of human liberty as the English race, and this England, which is to-day so great, has her greatness because no son of England

WOULD EVER SUBMIT TO TYRANNY,

and the people of England have again and again been driven into rebellion, because they could not otherwise than by rebellion obtain their rights. And if any one of those present were to stand up and dispute this, I could give him the names of rebels whose names are cherished in his heart as patriots and the saviours of liberty in England. You may say that the wretched, half-savage half-breeds are not fit to be compared to the heroes of British history. If you say so, so do I. There is no comparison at all between the two classes of men. But, gentlemen, the spirit of liberty is not the resul s of culture. It may be found in the lowest man. And let a man be ever so low, he has the right to justice whenever justice is denied to him. And remember this - remember this—these half-savage people who rebelled in the North-West did not rebel against the authority of Her Majesty the Queen. They did not rebel through any feeling of disloyalty to the British Crown or dislike of British institutions. They rebelled without any apparent plan or order of proceeding. The reason they rebelled is simple enough, and the reason is this: that the meanest worm that crawls upon the earth, when trampled upon, will endeavor to recoil and strike back, and I say that the guilt of the rebellion does not rest with these men so much as with those who provoked them. I say that the Government is

RESPONSIBLE FOR IT ;

I charge this against the Government, and I will endeavor, I think I will not fail, to prove that the half-breeds were denied for several long years rights and justice, rights which were admitted as soon as they were asked by bullets ; I charge against them that they have treated the half-breeds with contempt, with undisguised disdain ; I charge against them that they would not listen to their prayers ; I charge against them that they drove them to despair, that they drove them to the madness, to the rashness, to the crime which they afterwards committed. I have no doubt there are parties here who believe this language is too strong. I repeat the charge, gentlemen, and put myself altogether on your judgement. You will all admit with me that one of the most precious gifts which we enjoy under the constitution is the right of petition. It has always been one of the undoubted privileges of the realm of England that, whenever one of Her Majesty's subjects deems himself aggrieved in any particular,he has the right to approach the throne to petition the sovereign,and to explain his grievances whatever they may be. The half-breeds availed themselves of that right. For seven long years they sent into Ottawa petitions, memorials, representations of every kind, setting forth their grievances. For seven long years they never received anything like an answer. But now to-day we are told by the Government and by the friends of the Government that the half-breeds had really no grievances; that though they petitioned, they petitioned for frivolous objects. The Government denied everything. They commenced by denying that there were any petitions. Mr. Chapleau, some time ago, wrote a letter saying that the half-breeds had never made any representations; that if there had been any representations they would have been listened to. At the very moment when Mr. Chapleau was writing that letter. there was evidence in the blue books that seventy different com-

munications had, during a period of seven years, been sent by the half-breeds to Ottawa. But now they cannot stand upon that ground.

THEY CANNOT NOW DENY

that petitions were sent. But now they say that representations were made, but that they were frivolous. Frivolous! Perhaps, indeed, to the Government, who every day were distributing thousands and thousands of acres of more valuable land to their minions and friends. The grievance of the poor half-breed who was asking for his petty patch of land was a frivolous grievance. But to the half-breed that was his all. And, Sir, let the grievances of these men have been ever so frivolous, they had a right to an answer. And the moment that, petitioning as they did, they received no answer, that moment, even if their grievances had been frivolous, they became real. And I say now, what excuse can be given for that conduct? For seven long years the half-breeds petitioned and never received an answer. At last they received an answer. At last a promise was made, made to a delegation sent in 1883; but as I shall show you hereafter, that promise was broken; the word pledged by the Government was violated. Is it to be wondered at that the hearts of these men became embittered; that they lost faith in the Government; that they came to the conclusion that for them, at Ottawa, there was no justice and no hope; and that at last they resorted to the last argument which is always resorted to by men who have exhausted every other means of getting justice? But some will perhaps say: "Oh, but those who speak in behalf of the half-breeds are carried away by their feelings; they do not represent facts; they exaggerate the faults of the Government. I say that in this rather the state of things disclosed by the petitions is even worse than I have yet made out. I charge this against the Government, that not only did they refuse to answer the prayers that were sent to

them by those people, but I charge against the Government that they actually

CONCEALED THE TRUE STATE OF FACTS,

the petitions that were made daily to them; that they actually concealed them from the public at large, and from the representatives of the people at Ottawa. This is a strong charge to make, and I deliberately charge against the Government that they concealed information upon that subject for several years. And again, in regard to this statement, I place myself upon your judgment. Up to the time of the breaking out of the rebellion we knew comparatively little of the position of the half-breeds of the North-West Territory. We knew that there was discontent among the white people. We were not aware that there was more general and marked discontent among the half-breeds. But now and then faint echo of their complaints reached us. On the 7th of March, 1883, Mr. Blake made a motion asking for the production of certain papers. He made a motion for a return of copies of all correspondence and memorials relating to the claims of the inhabitants of Prince Albert and the neighboring districts in the North-West, in respect of the land they occupied, and other matters affecting their condition. Now, gentlemen, I see that there are friends of the Government here. I am glad of it. We cannot all hope to be of the same mind. But as I have said, I make a charge against the Government. It is on the judgment of its friends, that I place myself; and I repeat the charge that I made that the Government actually concealed information from the House. This motion was made on the 7th of March, 1883, calling for the production of ce tain papers in connection with the claims of the half-breeds.

WHEN WAS THE ORDER CARRIED OUT?

The order of the House was made on the 7th March 1883. A few weeks would have been sufficient to

bring those papers down. When was the order carried out? In 1883? No; not even in 1883. In 1884? No; not even in 1884. The papers were brought down on the 5th of May, 1885, when the rebellion had broken out; when insurgents were in the field; when blood had been shed; when it was too late for the taking of those remedial measures, which public opinion would have compelled, if public opinion had been in possession of the facts. Two long years had elapsed. Two sessions had elapsed before the order of the House was complied with, before the papers ordered were produced. What had we displayed before us here? I put it to the intelligence and fairness of every man not biased by party prejudice. Was it apathetic negligence or wilful concealment of information? If it was not apathetic negligence or wilful concealment of information, what was it? And whether it was the one or the other; whether it was neglect or wilful concealment, I say it was criminal. If my language is deemed too strong, let Ministers themselves explain. Let them say what qualification is to be given to their conduct. That is not all. Those papers produced on the 5th of May, 1885, after the rebellion had broken out, were not produced spontaneously by the Government. They were

WRENCHED FROM THE GOVERNMENT

by the persistance of Mr. Blake. After the rebellion had broken out there was a general cry for information. Every man wanted to know who were the half-breeds and what they complained of. Mr. Blake made himself the voice of the public upon this occasion. Day after day, after the news of the Duck Lake fight had come to us, Mr. Blake stood up asking the Government to bring down those papers for which he had asked two years before, and all other papers that would throw light upon the subject. Day after day it was refused. It was only by dint of great perseverance that the Government was actually induced to

bring down some papers, not all. We know now that some of the most important papers have been suppressed and never brought down to the House. You may ask me, what were the grievances of the half-breeds? What were they asking for? Simply this. They were asking to be treated in the same manner that the half-breeds of Manitoba had been treated, and nothing more, and nothing less. The half-breeds of Manitoba had been given titles for the lands which they occupied. The half-breeds of the North-West demanded the same thing. The half-breeds of Manitoba had been given a special grant of land for what we call the extinguishment of the Indian title; the half-breeds of the North-West demanded the same thing. And not only did they demand those things, but the white settlers demanded it for them, the officials of the Government demanded it for them, and it was refused. It was for seven long years refused. It was granted, when the half-breeds had made their demand with their guns in their hands. Then for the first time, the Government complied with their demand. But with this branch of the subject I leave Mr. Blake to deal. This was certainly a great grievance. Yet, if that had been the only grievance I would not sympathize with their cause as deeply as I do. But I say that the treatment which was meted out to them by the Government with regard to their lands was inhuman and crual;

SO INHUMAN AND CRUAL

that no people in the world would have submitted to it. You have heard the statement made by Ministers of the Crown, by members of Parliament and by the press that not one single half-breed had ever been ousted from his land. Ministers have made the statement; members of Parliament have repeated it; the press has repeated it until it has become a stock phrase in Tory literature. Well, I can understand members of Parliament and the press repeating the

statement. They accept the assertions of the Ministers. But as to the Ministers making that assertion, I am sure I cannot understand it, unless that in trying to convince others they have convinced themselves. You have, perhaps. heard of the story of the Frenchman who wanted to play a joke on a friend. It was in Marseilles, and he said—" If you go to the harbor you will find a whale. " The friend disbelieved him at first, but finally went to the harbor telling people whom he met, until quite a large crowd was gathered to see the whale in the harbour. The joker who had started the story saw the crowd and said:— " Well, perhaps, after all, there is something in it. I will go and see if there is not a whale in the harbor." When I read speeches of Mr. Thomas White, Mr. Thompson, and Mr. Foster, telling the people of this country that not one single half-breed has been dispossessed of his land, I often think of that story. I think that in trying to convince other people they have convinced themselves. They are very cunning They say, we challenge the Opposition to show that a half-breed has been dispossessed. They have confidence in the fact that it is their privilege to say what papers shall be brought down, and what shall be concealed. But I accept the challenge to prove that a half-breed has never been dispossessed of his land. Meagre as they have made the blue-book, there is enough to show that the assertion is true; that not only was more than one half-breed dispossessed, but that under the policy which was adopted by the Government,

THE WHOLE POPULATION

was liable to be evicted one by one. This is the charge that I make. Now you have often heard the Ministers say that not one half-breed was dispossessed. Let me at once call your attention to the following extract from a letter written by Father André to the North-West Council, in June. 1881:—

I beg of your indulgence to be obliged to make you acquainted with a grievance of mine, which, however, will give

you an idea of the state of things calling for a prompt remedy. I hold at Duck Lake a tract of land of about 200 acres, of which I have been in peaceful possession for over seven years. The land was fenced in, and cost me a good deal of money, and was always respected as the Catholic mission's property at Duck Lake. I was one of the first settlers at that place, and through my exertions the settlement increased rapidly, and nobody ever troubled me in my lawful possession of that land until last March, when a man by the name of J. Kelly jumped my claim, and, notwithstanding my protestations, claimed the land as his own, and put the frame of a house upon it, depriving me in that manner of half my property. And this is not the only occurence of the kind at Duck Lake.

Now, gentlemen, that may have been an ordinary case of trespass, such as might happen in any country, and there would have been nothing more to say; but I say this, and this is what I can prove, that this trespass was made upon a state of things

AIDED BY A GOVERNMENT,

and which Government never redressed, having often been applied to. What was the origin of them? In 1870 when the territories were annexed to Canada, there were several half-breed settlements on the Saskatchewan. There was a Scoth half-breed settlement at Prince Albert and a French half-breed settlement on the south branch at St. Laurent. These men had taken their lands, these Scoth and French half-breeds, each between three and four acres. Then as is shown in evidence, the particular manner in which all these people had taken their lands, not only the French half-breeds, but the Scotch half-breeds as well, all had taken their land fronting on the river, about ten chains and two miles deep. When this Government came into the country, they commenced to survey the wild land. They adopted the American system of survey. This was in sections of a square block forty chains wide and forty chains deep. I haven't the slightest objection to that kind of survey. It is no doubt a more scientific system to apply,

but you will agree with me it would have been an injustice to thus divide these lands which had been settled upon by these half-breeds in this manner, and there was a rebellion in 1869 and 1870. One of the chief causes was that surveyors of the Government, who were instructed to survey lands according to the sectional survey, carried their operations not only on the prairie, which would have been unobjectionable, but they carried their operations upon the settled lands of Red and Assiniboine rivers. There was a rebellion, and after that rebellion was settled it was decided that the lands occupied by half-breeds should be surveyed as they were possessed and the titles issued for them accordingly. After several years, as you are aware, they had the authority of the Government in the North-West and when Mr. Laird, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories, appointed by Mr. Mackenzie, reached the Territories in 1877, one of the first things which he did was to call upon the Government for a survey of the lands of half-breeds as they were occupied. But before I refer to the voice of Mr. Laird upon the subject, let me cite to you gentlemen,

A PETITION,

which was addressed to the Government at Ottawa in the year 1877 by George McKay and about one hundred and fifty Scotch half-breeds of Prince Albert settlement. In that petition George McKay and his fellow petitioners say this:—

The petition of the undersigned settlers and residents of Prince Albert settlement, in the North-West Territories of the Dominion of Canada, humbly represents, etc:

.....

Your petitioners, in conclusion, humbly represent that considerable portions of the lands at present occupied on the Saskatchewan River in this settlement were settled upon before the transfer of the North-West Territories to the Dominion of Canada, and in the manner customary to that period,

viz., in a narrow frontage and a depth of two miles. That the homes and other improvements of many of the settlers are situate upon these claims so taken. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that Your Excellency will, when instructions are issued to the Dominion surveyors, reserve the same rights and privileges to the aforesaid old settlers, and pioneers of this settlement, as were reserved to the old settlers in the province of Manitoba.

What, sir, was the purport of this petition? These Scotch half-breeds represented that they had taken land in the manner customary to the locality; that is to say, in narrow frontages upon the river, two miles deep. They asked that the general system of survey introduced by the Government be not introduced, but that a special survey should be granted, the same as had been granted in Manitoba. In that same year, Mr. Laird, then the Governor of the Territory, writing to the Government upon the same subject, expresses the same view. This is the letter of Mr. Laird, dated 12th February, 1877. It is addressed to the Minister of the Interior.

SIR,

I have the honour to transmit herewith extract of a letter from Mr. James Walker, Inspector of the North-West Mounted Police at Battleford, respecting disputes arising out of land claims at Prince Albert and St. Laurent. The subject is one materially affecting the prosperity of these and other settlements in the territories. I should hope, therefore, that the labors of the special survey party will be continued in the ensuing summer, and that points may be fixed which will enable the survey to be prosecuted along the Saskatchewan, where settlements exist or may soon be formed. It appears to me that, where there are settlements along the river, a system of survey similar to that adopted on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers will have to be conceded. Settlers should be allowed their frontage on the river, the lines running back so as to give them an average of 160 acres each.

The Minister of the Interior was

HONORABLE DAVID MILLS.

Mr. Mills complied with the petition, with the

very natural demands here set forth, and the very reasonable views propounded by Mr. Laird, and the memorandum which I hold in my hand, dated 14th March, 1877, adopted the proposal in all cases.

The programme of the special survey party provides for the work being extended during the coming season to intersect the Saskatchewan in the vicinity of the principal settlements on that river. It is proposed in all cases where settlement has been formed along the rivers in the territories to adopt the surveys of the farms accordingly, that is to say, giving an average (where practicable) of ten or twenty chains frontage on the river, and letting the lots run back far enough to make 160 acres each, the lines between lots, as a rule, to be made to conform to the section lines in the regular survey adjoining.

Such, you see, was

THE POLICY OF THE MACKENZIE GOVERNMENT.

In the open prairie where the land was unoccupied they applied the system of sectional survey to lay out the land in lots of 40 chains long and 40 wide, but wherever they found the settlements of half-breeds, Scotch or French, occupying their lands in narrow frontages, to divide their lands exactly as they were occupied, and I ask, could anything be fairer or more just? But, as you are aware, there was a change of Government in 1878. And with the change of Government, I am sorry to say, came also a change of policy. The policy, which was adopted at the time, is a policy which every man who recognizes justice must call tyrannical. Is there a man who can pretend that when these people had taken up their lands in narrow frontages of ten chains wide and two miles deep, taking their lands before there was Government in the North-West, taking those lands according to the custom of the country; is there a man who can pretend that to send surveyors to divide the land into square blocks was not an act of tyranny? I ask you, is this British fair play? I

refer you to the petition which I have just read, of George Mackay and 150 half-breeds. I am proud to say.

AS A REFORMER, AS A LIBERAL,

and a partisan of Mr. Mackenzie's Government that the prayer of these Scotch half-breeds was carried out. Their lands were surveyed accordingly in the summer of 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Government. Mr. Mills caused the lands of the Scotch half-breeds of Prince Albert and the French half-breeds of St. Laurent to be divided as they were occupied, and if they had followed any other course, every man not biased by party spirit would say they had committed an act of injustice and tyranny. But, with the change of Government, there was a change of policy also, and under the changed policy the square system of survey was applied everywhere in the territory, whether the lands were vacant or whether they were occupied. Again I do say, gentlemen, that this was one of the most annoying acts of tyranny that ever could be devised against a free and poor people. It would have been cheap justice, you will admit to me, when these people represented to the Government: "We took our lands before there was a Government here at at all, our lands have been improved greatly, grant us the favor not to divide these lands. But even

THIS CHEAP JUSTICE WAS REFUSED.

Let me refer you to another letter of Father André. It was addressed to Sir John Macdonald himself, and was dated 10th June, 1883:—

SIR:—I write you for the purpose of calling your attention to the painful, embarrassing position in which the French half-breeds settled on the southern banks of the Saskatchewan are placed. According to an old custom in Manitoba, they took up their lots ten chains wide in front by two miles in depth, trusting that the Government, acting on the rule already established, would survey these lands into lots ten chains in width by two miles in depth. Their surprise may be

imagined when they saw the lands along the Saskatchewan measured off into squares of forty chains without any heed being given to their just claims and protests. What is the result of this abnormal division? Our half-breeds were overwhelmed with difficulties on account of their land, and this proceeding will now sow division and discord among our people and will render the Government odious in their eyes, considering it as guilty of a gross injustice towards them. This survey lamentably mixes things. Some lose their land, which is being grabbed by their neighbors; others see the fruits of their industry and their fruits despoiled. This unhappy state of things could be easily made to cease by giving ear to their just claims. And how can this be refused them when you have granted a similar favor to Prince Albert? All the lands along the branch of the Saskatchewan have been surveyed in this manner, everybody was satisfied, and not the least complaint was heard about the survey. I cannot understand, sir, why your surveyors should have two different methods of parcelling the public domain, one for Prince Albert, ten chains in width by two miles in depth, which we approve and which we claim as a right, seeing you have granted it to Prince Albert, the other of blocking out the land in squares 40 chains without taking the river or, location of the settlers into consideration. The latter method we protest solemnly against, and humbly pray, sir, that you order a new survey, and thus validate our request; already the people of this colony have addressed you a petition on this subject, but the answer given under your directions is not one calculated to inspire them with the hope that you would right the wrong of which they complain; knowing the difficult situation in which our people are placed, I have resolved to make another effort, which I trust will bring happy results, and I dare to hope that you will accede to their just request, and no later than next summer order a new survey of the lands on the south branch of the Saskatchewan. By your kindly concurrence in this matter you will do an act of justice to our people and render them a service for which they will ever be thankful.

I have the honor to be, sir, your humble servant.

FATHER ANDRE,
Superior of St. Lawrence,
N.-W. T.
Grandin P. O.

Right Honorable
SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD,
Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

This is one of the petitions which were sent in by the half-breeds. Again, you will admit in the most courteous language, in the most reasonable language, setting forth facts, the positiveness of which everybody must admit. Yet

THAT PRAYER WAS DENIED.

Let me read you here the petition, which was sent about the same time by Gabriel Dumont, whose name has since become famous, who has been a rebel, as we all know; and perhaps this will show how he became a rebel. This is the petition addressed to Sir John Macdonald on the 4th September, 1882, by Gabriel Dumont and forty-two other half-breeds:

> We also pray that you would direct that the lots be surveyed along the river ten chains width by two miles in depth, this mode of division being the long established usage of the country. This would render it more easy for us to know the limits of our several lots. We trust, Sir, that you will grant a favorable hearing to this our petition, and that you will make known your decision as soon as possible. We await it with great anxiety, and pray God to protect you and keep you for the direction of this great country, which you so wisely govern.

Sir, this was not the language of a traitor, this was

NOT THE LANGUAGE OF A REBEL.

Gabriel Dumont prayed God that Sir John Macdonald might be spared to the country. Had his just petition been complied with, the man who at that time was a loyal subject and prayed God the First Minister might be spared to the country would not have become a rebel. Sir, the thing is so indefensible that the Ministers have not attempted to defend their acts upon their merits. I never yet heard a minister or any friend of the Government say that it was just and

reasonable and fair that these people, when they occupied their lands in their manner, should have them divided otherwise than as they were occupied. But there is another answer given. The answer given is that the half-breeds, who thus petitioned for new surveys, had settled upon their lands after survey. They say "We do not grant a new survey because they settled upon the lands after they had been surveyed; they knew what they were and they should have taken their lands accordingly." That would be perfectly just if the statement was correct, but I take issue upon that statement, and I have the proof that the statement is not correct. What witness shall I call to prove the assertion I now make? The witness, Sir, which I propose to bring forward to prove the assertion which I have made is Mr. George Duck, the land agent of the Government at Prince Albert. I might have taken advantage, also, of the testimony of Father André whose letter I have just read to you and which positively shows that the half-breeds who were petitioning the Government had taken the land before the survey according to the manner followed in the country, but here is the letter of Mr. Duck. Mr. Duck was the agent of the Government in the locality. He knew, he was familiar with the facts and all the circumstances. His testimony is of the greatest importance. What does he say? Does Mr. Duck say that the land had been taken after the survey? Mr. Duck says that the land was

TAKEN BEFORE THE SURVEY;

that the land was surveyed in square blocks while they were occupied by these half-breeds. And he advises what? A new survey. He advised a new survey to be satisfactory to these men. Let me read his letter:

DOMINION LAND OFFICE,

Prince-Albert, N. W. T., 11 March, 1882.

SIR,—As the majority of the settlers on the south branch of the River Saskatchewan, in the vicinity of the parish of St.

Laurent, have taken up their lands previous to the survey, with narrow frontages, similar to those river claims in other parts of this district and in view of the difficulty likely to be experienced in this office in adjusting the boundaries of these claims in accordance with the section survey, I have, at the request of several of the settlers so situated, the honor to request information as to the possibility of re surveying these sections into river lots on a similar plan to that adopted in Prince-Albert settlement, none of these claims having as yet been entered in this office.

(Signed) GEORGE DUCK,
Agent, Dominion lands.

To the Surveyor-General.
Ottawa.

This is the testimony of Mr. Duck. There is a pretence set forth by the Government that the half-breeds had settled upon the lands after the survey. This is not credited in this man's statement; he says that the great majority had taken their lands previous to this survey; that the surveys had been made

IN SPITE OF THEIR JUST RIGHTS.

He advised that a new survey should have taken place the same as had been granted the half-breeds of Prince-Albert under Mr. Mackenzie's regime. That is not all. There is still more very important evidence to call forth upon this point. I now bring fourth the testimony of no less a body than the North-West Council. Here is a memorial addressed to the Government at Ottawa by the North-West Council in the month of October, 1883:

Your memorialists further pray that the half-breeds in the Territories who have not participated in the arrangement to extinguish the half-breed claim in Manitoba should enjoy the same rights as accorded half-breeds in that province.

Your memorialists also pray for more extended surveys in the country of the North Saskatchewan, that the special settlement survey of the South Saskatchewan, in the parish of St Antoine, made by Mr. Aldons, Dominion land surveyor, be approved, and that the land agent at Prince-Albert be

instructed to receive entries for such lands; that the lands of the parish of Grandin, St Laurent, and St Louis, and fronting on the South Saskatchewan, be surveyed into ten chain lots, they being occupied by settlers in this manner.

Now, in the face of that testimony, is there a man that can now abide by the pretence now set forth by the Government, that they refused the resurvey because the half-breeds had settled on the land after the survey, the whole of the evidence, not only of half-breeds, not only of the missionaries, but of their own officers and the North-West Council shows that the lands were taken by the half-breeds before they were surveyed and that the only proper justice would have been to resurvey the lands, as was demanded by Mr. Duck and demanded by the North-west Council. What was the answer to all these petitions of these representatives and settlers? The answer came once in the month of October, 1883, and it was that no lands would be surveyed except upon the ordinary system of survey. Now, gentlemen, is it any wonder that these men's hearts were embittered when they saw the North-West Council demanded the same justice they demanded, and the officers of the Government demanded the same justice that they demanded, that when they found their missionaries, all men of grace, demanding for them the same justice which they were demanding and all these prayers were refused,

IS IT ANY WONDER

that these men's hearts grew bitter and rebellion took place in 1885? It was nearly taking place in 1882. Here are the circumstances. In 1882, some surveyors were operating in the vicinity of a settlement called St. Albert, near Edmonton. They were operating and dividing the lands as usual into square blocks of forty chains. They were approached by a few settlers, whose object it was to prevent them from carrying out their operations. These surveyors went to the mission-

[illegible] of the place, Father Leduc, and told that father [illegible] advise the people to allow them to go on with their operations, stating that they would come back at a later day and divide the lands so that the people could get their narrow long blocks. Father Leduc advised [illegible] the surveyors go on with their operations, after the promises just made to them that one of them would come back in a short time and divide their lands as they occupied them. Then the surveyors [illegible] They carried on their operations, [illegible] on this land in square blocks, [illegible] and commenced to divide the [illegible] strips.

[illegible] Ottawa to have that sur[illegible] let the system of sur[illegible] started go on. This pro[illegible] was therefore violated. Well [illegible] anger and indignation of these [illegible]

[illegible] AGITATED.

[illegible] events, received. Still [illegible] violent meas[illegible] gather as you are [illegible] position and [illegible] They chose [illegible] a gentleman [illegible] at Ottawa in [illegible] day they had [illegible] several inter[illegible] in so many [illegible] granted, and that [illegible] was accepted. But Fa[illegible] in writing and [illegible] persevere and to [illegible] at last he ob[illegible] that day, [illegible] which all [illegible] set forth in their

petition, were acceded to. In that writing it was stated that a special survey would be granted, and "that lands, occupied or possessed before the annexation of the North-West Territories to the Dominion, will be recognized by the Government." I will not give you any more of the document. This is enough. There is the promise given by the Minister of the Interior. With this promise Father Leduc went back to the Saskatchewan. He went back to the Forks, where the two branches unite, visiting settlement after settlement, and informing them of the good news that at last a survey would be made. Let me say before I proceed any further that we did not find this paper amongst the papers that were brought down by the Government. This paper has been kept in a pigeonhole. The Government has suppressed the information it contained from the people. But we found it, and Mr. Blake read it in the House of Commons and charged that a member of the Government had signed the paper, and his charge was never contradicted, never even challenged. And now, sir, as I said, Father Leduc went up and gave the good news to the settlers and said to them: "We will have justice at last." He told them that a re-survey would be made. And what was the consequence? What followed? The solemn promise made over the signature of the Minister of the Interior

WAS BROKEN AND VIOLATED.

The word of Her Majesty, as represented by her Ministers, was broken. Is it any wonder, I ask again, that these men's hearts were getting bitter? If you want any proof of what I now tell you, let me read you a petition sent on the 19th of November, 1883, by William Bremner and some 23 or 24 other half-breeds to Mr. Duck:—

St. Louis de Langevin, 19th Nov., 1883,

SIR,

The undersigned farmers, resident of the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, on the south branch of the Saskatchewan, beg

to set forth, as follows, their grievances in relation to the lands on which they are located: Many of us are here since the years 1873-74, and the others in still greater numbers, since 1880. Each and all of us took up our lands in accordance with the method formerly prevailing on the lands of the Red River and the Assiniboine—that is to say, in river lots. In the autumn of 1880, we petitioned the Minister of the Interior at Ottawa for a special survey into river lots, as was granted to the Prince Albert settlement and to a portion of the St. Laurent settlement, and we all signed that petition, excepting Michael [illegible], who has since entered [illegible] office as a section [illegible] against which we hereby strongly protest. Since that time we have sent more petitions, at various times, to the same effect, supporting the same with the influence of [illegible] such as [illegible] Lieutenant-Governor North-West [illegible] Father [illegible] and Father [illegible] as a delegate to travel to the people of Batoche and Prince Albert, [illegible] the Government granting a special survey [illegible] the Saskatchewan. Since then we have [illegible] and the new survey [illegible] we stated at the beginning [illegible] long enough [illegible] as yet, [illegible] We have [illegible] represent [illegible] part set [illegible] as possible [illegible] Her Majesty the Queen of England.

That was [illegible] which, along with the [illegible] gentlemen, what were the [illegible] state of things? The [illegible] was that the half-breeds were [illegible]

[illegible]

Here is the [illegible] very good law. [illegible] years of age, [illegible] in the North-West Territories. [illegible] been made out and the plans have [illegible] spent.

any subject of Her Majesty can go to the office of the agent and make an entry for any quarter section which he chooses to take up, and by taking it, he becomes vested with the right to it. Does the half-breed possess the same right? No. They do not possess the right of entry. And why do they not possess it? The reason is obvious. The land agent has plans of a township, one of those townships where the rebellion occurred. In this plan, the lands are laid down in square blocks 40 chains long and 40 chains wide. If a half-breed comes to the agent, the latter would tell him, " I will give you an entry for a homestead, on any part of the plan you choose. " The half-breed points to a piece of land ten chains wide and two miles long, and says, " I want to make an entry for that piece of land. " The agent says, no, I cannot do that; but I will give you an entry for this piece, forty chains by forty chains, " " But, " says the half-breed, " if you give me a piece of land forty chains wide it will cover part of the land already occupied; and if you give me 40 chains in length it will cover land occupied by some one else; therefore I cannot make the entry. " This is obvious. If there is any necessity of proving it by evidence, let me read to you here a letter sent to Mr. Duck by Louis Schmidt:

Grandin, Saskatchewan, N. W. T.
26th april, 1884.

SIR,—I beg to lay before you the following facts:—I am one of the settlers on the South Saskatchewan, who, during the last four years have sent petitions upon petitions to your Department to have the land surveyed in ten or twenty chains frontage by one or two miles long, the same as has been done for the Prince-Albert settlement on both the north and south branches of the Saskatchewan. I regret to say that so far our prayer has not yet been granted, nor even an answer of any kind been given, and I feel bound to say that such a state of things is almost intolerable. The most part of these settlers, and I am among the number, have held on and cultivated their lands for over three years, and ought to be entitled to a patent from the Crown. Yet, as they have taken up their

lands close to each other, and in the hope of having them subdivided in river lots, they have not been able to enter them in the Lands Office. You see, sir, in a glance the real state of things, and I need not occupy your valuable time any longer in entering into more details. I pray you, therefore, most earnestly, to have the matter remedied, for the satisfaction of so many loyal subjects of Her Majesty and of your humble servant.

LOUIS SCHMIDT.

Honorable the Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

This letter, sir, proves that the half-breeds could not make entries for these lands. But if a would-be settler comes from the outside, from the provinces of Quebec or Ontario or from Europe with no such scruples as entertain the half-breeds, he will go to the agent and make an entry for one of those lands knowing it was occupied, and with the title to the quarter section in his pocket, he will go and say to the half-breed:

"GO; THIS LAND IS MINE."

Here is the evidence that such a state of things not only existed, but that facts of that nature took place. The petition which I have just read to you was forwarded to Ottawa on the 9th of December, 1883, together with the prayers of Louis Schmidt and John Baptiste Boucher. Then you have the evidence—the answer to the challenge thrown to us by the Government that no half-breed has ever been dispossessed. You have in their own blue book proof that half-breeds have been actually dispossessed.

Mr. Laurier then read an extract from a speech delivered by the Honorable Thomas White in answer to the preceding charges made by the present speaker on a previous occasion, Mr. White accused Mr. Laurier of "talking nonsense." "Talking nonsense!" said Mr. Laurier. This is a very summary way of disposing of the accusations. But everyone must fight with their weapons, and it seems to me that weapons of the

Minister of the Interior are not well furbished. They want polish, and may then get a little more victory. In the extract read by Mr. Laurier, Mr. White was reported also as saying that Mr. Laurier had stated in a dispute over lands in the North-West the individual who obtained possession by ousting a half-breed was named Salter. Salter, Mr. White said, was an English name, and thus Mr. Laurier, he contended, had given the impression that a half-breed had been deprived of his land by an English settler.

Mr. Laurier, continuing, said:—Sir, I protest against such an insinuation. Mr. White sought to convey the impression that I had been appealing to race prejudices. I have never been guilty of anything so low as that. I have again and again in the province of Quebec, as I do now, attacked the policy of the Government regarding this question, but Heaven is my witness that never did I call upon any race feeling in the province of Quebec. The language which I have used in the province of Quebec is the language which I use here to-night. I have no two languages, one for the French Canadians and the other for the English Canadians. We stand here upon the broad ground of British liberty and British justice. But Mr. Salter was one of the original settlers in the parish of St Louis de Langevin, and so was his neighbor, the gentleman with whom he was disputing. The gist of my defence is this:—That the dispute was between two half-breeds over a piece of land, and these cases are not uncommon in the North-West Territory. I will go further, and I will say that disputes about the possession of land are not only not uncommon in the North-West Territories, but are common where there are men and neighbors. There will be disputes

AS LONG AS THERE ARE MEN.

It is not uncommon to have these disputes about land in the province of Quebec, and the province of Ontario, but here is the difference - Mr. White would argue that this was a case of trespass, simple trespass,

a violation of the law, a half-breed encroaching upon another half-breed. The difference was this :—Thomas Salter did not commit any trespass, did not commit any violation of the law; but when Thomas Salter came to dispossess his neighbor, he had in his hand the authority of the Government. He had in his hand an entry which he had made; he was not breaking the law; he was acting according to the law made by the Government of Canada. This is the difference, and this is what the people of Ontario will understand that this is the difference in the case to which I have referred. That could not have been remedied in court of justice. If it had been an ordinary trespass such as we see everywhere in human society, he could have settled it in a court of justice, but the man says : —" Here is my title, I have it from the Government of Canada. " This is why these men were so embittered. They were so liable to be evicted not illegally, but legally with the sanction of the Government. Is it to be wondered at, again I say, that the hearts of these men grew embittered when again and again they appealed to the Government and got no answer? Here they found themselves evicted one by one. Is it any wonder that these men at last

LOST ALL PATIENCE

and faith in the Government? You are told by the Government and by their friends that the rebellion was due simply to the agitation of Riel. In the summer of 1884, when they had been petitioning for three long years with no avail, they sent for Riel, the only educated man of the race—they sent for him. He commenced the agitation, but what did the Government do? Did they do a single act to remedy the state of things which then prevailed in these territories, when they knew, as they must have known, that Riel was a dangerous character?—I never said the contrary. The Government knew it. Did they act upon their knowledge? When this man was brought into the territory,

when he commenced the agitation, a peaceable constitutional agitation for six long months, what did the Government do to remedy that state of things, to prevent the continuance of that agitation which might end, as it did end, in rebellion? They sent a police force to Fort Carlton to overawe the people and to prevent them making their claims. Are we in British territory, or are we in Russia? That is the way that Russia ever treated poor Poland. Whenever that unfortunate nation asked for liberty, the Russian Government did as the Canadian Government in 1884; instead of meeting the just demands of the people, it sent military forces to Warsaw to overawe the people, to put down those who had the temerity to raise their voices in favor of their own friends. We are told now that the rebellion was caused by the malice of Riel. Let me bring forward

THE TESTIMONY OF THE POLICE FORCE

sent to Fort Carlton, Superintendent Gagnon, who wrote on 23rd December, 1884, to Major Crozier :—

Sir:—I have to honor to report that during the last month the half-breeds of St Laurent and Batoche settlements held a public meeting to adopt a petition drawn up by a committee, and that this petition, signed by the settlers of both settlements, has been forwarded to Ottawa. This meeting, from all reports, seems to have been very orderly. Several other smaller reunions have taken place during the same period, but all had reference to school matters. The half-breeds are pressing Riel to settle among them, and have given him, as a token of their gratitude for services rendered, a house well furnished, and will further, on 2nd January next, present him with a purse. These testimonials are for the good-will of the majority, and would go towards denying certain rumors which say that several are lacking confidence in their leader, that his way of acting and speaking denotes a very hot head, and that he does not agree with their priests.

.....

As far as I can see, the chief grievance of the half-breeds is that they are afraid the Government will not sanction the way they amongst themselves have agreed to take their homesteads—ten chains frontage on the river by two miles back.

Here was the last warning given to the Government by one of their own officers at so late a day as 23rd December. The rebellion broke out four months afterwards. But they took no steps in the meantime to give satisfaction to these people, not a step, warned though they were, though they saw the danger, and though the agitation was ever increasing, growing more and more bitter, yet in the face of all that they never took a step, they never did an act to remove this state of things which must have ended as it did end in rebellion. Now, gentlemen of Toronto, men of English blood and descent, let me ask this of every one of you: If you had been yourselves fated to be born on the banks of the Saskatchewan before there ever was a government in the territory, and you had taken your land according to the manner of the country, and if, when the government was founded, they had sent surveyors into the country cutting your land into pieces; if after you had made remonstrances after remonstrances you had been given a promise that justice would be done and that promise was broken; if after every other means had been tried and found of no avail,

WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE DONE?

Before I proceed any further, let me quote the language which was spoken upon one occasion by the great Earl of Chatham, the greatest man of his day, the man who first started England in the 18th century on that career of victory and glory which she has been following ever since. Let me tell you what he once said. The American colonies to the south of us were then in open rebellion, fighting the British Government. Lord Chatham, old and feeble, came to the House of Lords one day, upbraided the Ministers for being the cause of that rebellion, telling them that they had no right to tax people that were not represented in the British Parliament; that it was an act of tyranny on their part. He said "If I were an

American, as I am an Englishman, while foreign troops remained in the country I never would lay down my arms! Never! Never! Never!" If the editors of the good loyal Tory newspapers of Ontario had been living in that day, what would they have said of that remark of Lord Chatham's? For my part, gentlemen, I am a loyal subject, but I have the courage of my convictions, whether they are right or wrong. I believe those men were

GOADED TO REVOLUTION,

but when they rebelled they committed a crime against the peace. I was not born on the banks of the Saskatchewan, but on those of the St Lawrence, and when the rebellion took place I had a seat in Parliament. I owed allegiance to my sovereign, and I knew my rights as a citizen and my duties as a subject of Her Majesty. When the volunteers were called out, the Government, for the first time in this whole matter, did its duty. The rebellion had broken out and had to be suppressed. The Government had to be sustained; I sustained it. The Liberal party as a party offered no opposition to the Government in this matter until the back of the rebellion had been broken and all danger was passed. Then when the law had been vindicated, came the time to arraign the Government and I took another step also. I say it was my view and not that of the whole Liberal party. It was a matter upon which everyone took his own side, and my view was that since the rebellion had been provoked clemency should have followed in the steps of victory. This is the course which I took. It is not the unanimous course of the Liberal party on this question. Every man acts according to his own conscience. Sir, convinced as I am that these men were in the right, that they were defending their just rights, that they had been driven to crime by the Government, I again expressed my convictions upon that subject in as strong language as was at my command.

I knew that I had been the cause of scandal to the numerous tribe of Tory editors who have lashed their brains most unmercifully in order to bring against me some grand sentence of scorn and indignation. My native land is not only the province of Quebec, where I was born, but it extends all over portions of this continent covered by the British flag. My kindred are not only those in whose veins flow the blood that flows in my veins. My kindred are all those of whatever race or creed who on this continent live

UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE BRITISH FLAG,

and you will certainly all agree with me that the purpose of God is that all races who are covered by the British flag shall be equal before the law, and when we find a Government ill-treating a poor people, simply because they are poor and ignorant, we resent it. When we find them violating that purpose of God, I say that it behooves us to freely fight for it with all the means that the constitution places in our hands.

" HOME RULE " FOR IRELAND

VIGOROUS PLEA IN FAVOR OF THE IRISH

DEFECTIVENESS OF LEGISLATIVE UNION IN ENGLAND AND IN CANADA

PROTEST AGAINST COERCION

Twice previously in 1882 and 1886, had the House of Commons voted addresses to the Queen in favor of Ireland in its struggle for self-government. In 1887, the situation had become still more painful, the right of free meeting and discussion having received a terrible blow from the severe measures instituted by Mr. Balfour, the new Secretary of State for Ireland. On the 21st April, 1887, Mr. Curran moved resolutions protesting against the "coercion bill." The debate lasted several days and ended in the adoption of the resolutions by a vote of 135 against 47, in spite of the opposition of the Premier and of several of his colleagues and principal supporters, Messrs Bowell, Carling, White, Tupper, Haggart, Foster, and McCarthy. But this opposition was powerless against the coalition of all the Irish members in both parties with the French Canadians and the entire Liberal party. Mr. Laurier supplies the explanation of this patriotic alliance between the Irish, French Canadians and Liberals, in the following speech which we take from the Hansard :

Mr. Laurier :— As this House has already twice expressed its sympathy with Ireland in the cause of

Home Rule, there would not be, under ordinary circumstances, any occasion for an additional expression of views and wishes already well known. But the circumstances to-day are not ordinary; they are even more painful and deplorable than the ordinary circumstances of that unhappy land. A new calamity menaces it, a calamity of so great a character that it calls for an additional expression of the sympathy, not only of those who love Ireland, but of those as well who love England and fair play and are proud of her name. It must be admitted that it is a most evil day, indeed, not only for Ireland, but for England as well, when in this Jubilee year, in any part of the British Empire, a civilized people is to be

SUBJECTED TO LAWS SO CRUEL

as those contemplated to be imposed upon the people of Ireland. The honorable member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeil), who addressed the House yesterday, concluded an able and moderate speech which was directed mostly to establish the proposition that coercion in Ireland was necessary, by proposing a resolution to the effect that the Parliament of Canada should not express any opinion as to the course of Imperial legislation, because our Parliament had not the requisite information upon which to offer an opinion; but the honorable gentleman himself must have thought we had sufficient information, since he came to the conclusion, in his speech, if not in his motion, that coercion was necessary for Ireland. On the other hand, the friends of Ireland, with the same information at their command as the honorable gentleman has, may come to a different conclusion, and believe that the true course to be followed is not the course of coercion, but that of freedom. But, moreover, Mr. Gladstone, fighting on behalf of the Irish people, invites all those who sympathize with Ireland to record their sympathy with the struggle

now being made. In a late letter he speaks as follows:—

> I attach very high value and importance to the manifestation, now incessant, of American as well as Colonial sympathy with the Irish people in the crisis created by the causeless, insulting and insidious bill at present before Parliament.

Well, if the advice of the friends of Ireland may be of value to those who are now engaged in fighting her battle, it seems to me that the advice of all those subjects of Her Majesty, who have enjoyed

THE BENEFITS OF HOME RULE

for fifty years, may be of still greater value from their experience of the blessings of Home Rule; and in that view I say emphatically that the suggestions of no class of Her Majesty's colonial subjects, as to the blessings of Home Rule, may be more profitable than the suggestions of Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. And, speaking as a French Canadian, I cannot help comparing the history of my own country with the history of Ireland to-day. I see much similitude between the situation of Ireland to-day and the situation of Canada, and especially Lower Canada, fifty years ago. It seems to me that the public men who to-day have to deal with the cause of Ireland are hampered by a distrust of the Irish people in the same way as the public men who had to deal with the cause of Canada fifty years ago were hampered by a distrust of the people of Canada. There are only two ways of governing men—by despotism or coercion, if you choose to call it by that name, or by freedom. You can coerce an inferior and an uncivilized race, but never a proud and self-respecting people. Coercion has been tried, not once or twice, but times almost without number in Ireland, and it has failed every time; and, if tried again, it must fail as it did before. The Irish people would not be the proud people that they are, if they were to be cowed by coercion into

abandoning one single iota of what they deem to be their just rights. The honorable member for Bruce (Mr. McNeil) said yesterday that coercion had been successful. At least I understood him to say so in regard to the last coercion bill, that it suppressed crime. How can such language be held?

IF COERCION HAD BEEN SUCCESSFUL

in Ireland, how is it that the state of Ireland is what it is to-day? The honorable gentleman himself devoted the greater part of his speech to demonstrate that crime to-day is rampant in Ireland. Coercion can punish crime, it can crush out all expressions of public opinion, it can choke in the throat even before they are uttered all words of complaint or remonstrance, but it cannot breed contentment and affection in the hearts of the people for the Government, it can not induce that cheerfulness and allegiance which should be the aim towards which every Government should tend. What is wanted to-day in Ireland is not a law to punish crime, but a state of things which will suppress crime by suppressing the motive for crime, the motive for agrarian crime, which is the only crime existing in Ireland. What is wanted is a state of things which will bring contentment to the hearts of the people, a state of things which will make the people happy and proud of their allegiance. This is what is wanted to-day in Ireland, and, since it is proved, and proved, it seems to me, beyond dispute, that coercion has failed as often as it has been tried, I ask of those who to-day support coercion, not only in this Parliament but out of this Parliament, if it would not be well to try the other method of governing men, the method of freedom? Strange to say, all those who to-day oppose Home Rule, whether on this continent or on the other continent, all those who to-day advocate coercion, must admit, and they do admit, with more or less reluctance, that

SOME KIND OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

should be granted to Ireland. Even the honorable gentleman who placed in your hands the amendment you now have, though his speech was devoted to the proposition that coercion was necessary, still in this amendment adhered to the resolutions in favor of Home Rule which were passed by this House. This is not unusual. All these statesmen, as far as my knowledge goes, in England or out of England, who have treated that subject and have come to the conclusion that coercion was necessary, at the same time have said that, after all, the present state of things was intolerable, and that some kind of local government should be devised for Ireland. At the same time they are misty in their views. While stating that in one breath, they stifle it in the next; whilst admitting that Ireland should have some kind of local administration, still they all conclude their utterances by stating that, after all, the Imperial Parliament should have absolute control over local matters. And what is the secret of it all? The secret is that the men who deal with that question and oppose Mr. Gladstone at this moment, distrust the people of Ireland, and one and all believe that, if anything like legislative independence were given to the people of Ireland, the people of Ireland would simply make it a stepping stone towards effecting complete separation from the Empire. As far as that goes, I am reminded of the history of my own country, of the history of Canada, and especially of Lower Canada. The honorable gentleman who seconded the address the other day, the honorable member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in an able and well-tempered speech, referred to the fact, that in the first year of Her Majesty's reign there was rebellion in these provinces. He took some pride in saying that there had been no rebellion in the Maritime provinces. That is so. There was no rebellion in the Maritime provinces, but there was discontent in the Maritime provinces, there was agita-

tion in the Maritime provinces, and what was the cause of it? The discontent and the agitation arose from the fact that the people of the Maritime provinces, in common with the people of all the British provinces, demanded at that time more extended local liberty. There was the same discontent throughout the length and breadth of Upper Canada. There was even

REBELLION IN UPPER CANADA,

though it was restricted within narrow limits. But there was rebellion throughout Lower-Canada, rebellion, which was profound, bitter and deep-rooted. We have heard of late that rebellion may exist without cause, that it may exist out of sheer malice, and mere wantonness; but the Government of England did not believe so. The Government of England thought that, since the people of the British colonies had risen in arms against the Government, there must be some cause for that uprising, and they sent out one of the most eminent men of his day, Lord Durham, to investigate the cause of that rebellion. Lord Durham came here, he did his work, and he did it well; he investigated the causes which had led to the rebellion in Lower-Canada, and to the rebellion in Upper-Canada, and which had spread discontent all over British territory in America, and he reported to his Government. It is not my duty to-day to review the report of Lord Durham at length. If that were my duty, I should have to take most serious exception to some of the conclusions at which he arrived, especially as they affected my own countrymen, of French origin; but I am speaking to-day only of the general causes, which, in the opinion of Lord Durham, led to rebellion in two of the provinces, and general discontent all over the provinces, and the remedy which he then suggested. Lord Durham laid down as the cause of that rebellion and discontent the fact that the aspirations of the people for freedom of local govern-

ment were continually checked by the conduct of the Colonial Office, and he suggested as a remedy that the provinces should be allowed the most

COMPLETE LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE.

He said that legislative independence should be even given to those colonies which, at that time, were in the throes of civil war. His idea was that, if the aspirations of the people for absolute untrammelled freedom of local government continued to be checked by the Colonial Office, the irritation produced by that course would lead the people to ask not only for local freedom, but for absolute severance from the Empire. Whereas if the wishes of the people for local government were granted, if they had absolute independence in their local affairs, their local interests and their Imperial pride would be at once gratified and the flag which protected their local liberties and recalled to them so many glorious associations, would be made all the dearer to their hearts. It was a bold conclusion, so bold, indeed, that the most liberal-minded statesmen of the day in England shrank from it, in the same manner that to day the most liberal-minded men in England shrink from applying the same doctrine to the government of Ireland.

Lord John Russell, who was at the time Colonial Secretary, and one of the most liberal-minded men of his day, had to review the report made by Lord Durham. He agreed in almost everything that Lord Durham had said, except in the particular of giving free and independent legislatures to the colonies. Upon that subject he spoke as follows:—

It does not appear to me that you can subject the Executive Council of Canada to the responsibility which is fairly demanded of the Ministers of the Executive Power in this country.

And after having dilated at length upon this idea, he concluded as follows:—

I know no reason why the Legislative Assembly, whether of each, separately, or of both provinces united, should not be

listened to with deference; but I am not prepared to lay down a principle, and a new principle, for the future government of the colonies, that we ought to subject the Executive there to the same restrictions which prevail in this country.

Speaking of the impossibility which existed in his mind of granting the same amount of legislative independence to the colonies that existed in the mother-country, he made these other remarks:—

But the Governor of Canada is acting not in that high and unassailable position in which the Sovereign of this country is placed. He is a governor receiving instructions from the Crown on the responsibility of a Secretary of State. Here, then, at once, is an obvious and complete difference between the Executive of this country and the Executive of a colony. The Governor might ask the Executive Council to propose a certain measure. They might say they could not propose it unless the members of the House of Assembly would adopt it. But the Governor might reply that he had received instructions from home commanding him to propose that measure. How, in that case, is he to proceed? Either one power or the other must be put aside. Either the Government must control the House of Assembly, or else the Governor must become a mere cipher in the hands of the Assembly, and not attempt to carry into effect the measures commanded by the Home Government.

So, then, such a liberal-minded man as Lord John Russell could not see his way to adopt the conclusion of Lord Durham, and to grant absolute legislative independence and responsible government to a colony. To him the obstacles seemed to be insurmountable. We are aware that those views of Lord John Russell prevailed for some years. The government of the colonies was attempted to be carried on the same lines here traced by Lord John Russell, that is to say, upon the old lines, not upon the lines traced by Lord Durham; not upon the view that responsible government should be granted to the colony. It is a well-known fact that during those years this country had no peace; it is a well-known fact that during all

that time an agitation was constantly kept up, and the country led a miserable life and made no progress. But at last a master-mind came to this country

IN THE PERSON OF LORD ELGIN,

and he did not shrink from giving us the absolute legislative independence for which the country had been recommended to the statesmen of Great Britain, but which they deemed to be inconsistent with the interests of the Empire to grant. Lord Elgin did not hesitate to subject the Ministry of the country to the same responsibilities and the same restrictions that prevailed in England. We know that he did this in spite of all the reports of the Tory party in England, who at that time fought against Canadian freedom with the same bitterness and violence with which they are now fighting against Irish freedom. But notwithstanding all those efforts Lord Elgin's view prevailed England granted the most complete legislative independence, and responsible government was introduced into the provinces as absolutely and as completely as it is carried out in England. Did any of the dangers which were expected to follow from this course, arise? Nor did the Imperial interest suffer and the agitation, which had been going on for local freedom, immediately ceased ; immediately contentment prevailed where there had been discontent, and loyalty followed where there had been disloyalty before. And to-day, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, in this the Jubilee year of Her Majesty's reign, there is not in this broad Empire an inch of ground where there is more dutiful and more loving allegiance than in this very country where fifty years ago rebellion was bitter and deep-rooted. That is

THE EFFECT OF LIBERTY,

that is the effect of local freedom granted to Canada. What would be the condition of Canada to-day if this

course had not been followed, if the old practice had been followed of keeping the people under subjection, of refusing them those local liberties for which they were clamoring? Our condition to-day would be the condition of Ireland to-day, that of sullen discontent and agitation a constant praying for reforms which were never granted.

Sir, there is no rebellion to-day in Ireland, it is true, but is there contentment? Is there cheerfulness of heart in the allegiance which they owe to the Crown of England? Sir, the condition of the Irish people to-day is about the most miserable of any people in Europe. Must this last forever? Is there no remedy to such a state of things? It has lasted already for seven long years, and shall we be told to-day that there is no remedy for the evil? I say, in view of our own experience, there is a remedy, and that remedy is not coercion, but freedom. Let the English Government treat the Irish people as they have treated the Canadian people. Let them trust the Irish people as they have trusted the Canadian people. Let them appeal to their hearts, to their gratitude, to their nobler sentiments. Let them loosen the grip in which they now hold that unfortunate land, let them give them some measure of local liberty, let them restore the Parliament to College Green, and I venture to say that this long accumulated bitterness caused by ages of oppression will melt away in a very few years; I venture to say that, after that, the bond of union between England and Ireland will be stronger than it ever was before. It will not be a bond of union based upon physical force, but it will be a bond of union based upon mutual affection and respect. Sir, we will be told perhaps, "Oh, but there are demagogues in Ireland who would prevent such a course." There may be demagogues in Ireland; but demagogues in a free and happy country are not dangerous, it is

THE TYRANNY OF A GOVERNMENT

that makes demagogues dangerous and powerful. We will be told again: "But there are men in Ireland who would not be content with local liberty, who would aspire to a complete separation of Ireland from the Empire." That may be true, I dare say it is true. But I say again that if there are such men, their power would not last one minute after Ireland had obtained that local liberty which she now asks; yes, their power would not last, because either they would themselves have to be reconciled to the existing state of things, or their power would be gone. Just take the example of Papineau in Lower Canada. There was never a man in any nation who commanded a greater sway over the hearts and minds of his fellow-countrymen than did Papineau before the year of rebellion of 1837. Yet after the rebellion, after we had been granted responsible government, Papineau attempted an agitation with the people of Lower Canada to induce them to repeal the Act of Union, and that agitation fell perfectly flat; the same men who a few years before would have shed their blood at his command were no longer responsive to his voice. What was the reason? The simple reason was, that the people had obtained local liberties which secured and protected them, and they were reconciled and satisfied with their condition. Such would be the result, I venture to say, if the same policy were followed in Ireland that was followed in Lower Canada; and such being the case it behooves us, not only does it behoove us, but it seems to me it is our bounden duty, as members of this great Empire, to strain every nerve in order to strengthen the hands of those struggling in the cause of Ireland, and to show by our living experience that in order to make the government of Ireland strong, it is necessary simply to make the people free.

MR. LAURIER,
Leader of the Canadian Liberal Party

GRAND OVATION IN HIS HONOR

THE PIC-NIC AT SOMERSET

It was an occasion of great rejoicing throughout the province of Quebec when the Liberal members of the House of Commons, against his own wishes, in 1887, met and chose Mr. Laurier to succeed Honorable Edward Blake as their leader. A great pic-nic, in honor of the event, was organized and took place on the 2nd August of the same year at Somerset (Megantic) and at this pic-nic the admirers of the " future Prime Minister of the Dominion " gathered in thousands. The leaders and principal members of the party came from all points of the province by the regular trains from Montreal, Quebec, Levis and St Hyacinthe and by special trains from Coaticook, Richmond, Three-Rivers and Arthabaska. On the stand, when the meeting opened, there were at least two hundred Senators, Federal and Provincial members, ex-members, journalists &c. Congratulatory addresses were presented to Mr. Laurier by the inhabitants of the place (Plessisville) and of Drummond and Arthabaska and by the *Club National* of St Hyacinthe, the *Club National* of Coaticook and the Liberals of Richmond. The speakers on the occasion were: Honorable Mr. Laurier, Honorable Mr. Mercier, Premier of the province of Quebec; Mr. John Whyte, ex M. P. P., Mr. Geo. Turcot, M. P. for Megantic, Honorable C. A. P. Pelletier, C. M. G., Mr. G. Amyot, M. P. for Bellechasse, Mr. J. Lavergne, M. P. for Drummond and Arthabaska, Dr. Turcotte and Mr. Ernest Tremblay. The programme speech made by Mr. Laurier aroused extraordinary

enthusiasm, being particularly remarked for the preference which the orator gave to a British customs union, if at all realizable, over the American customs union, which then held the place of unlimited reciprocity before the public eye, and, at a time when French Canadian loyalty was keenly called into question by their traducers, this declaration falling from the lips of one of the most authorized representatives of the French Canadians was a summary reply to such insinuations.

(*Translation.*)

MR CHAIRMAN,
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

No doubt, I should commence by expressing all the gratitude I feel for the more than cordial reception you have given to me on the present occasion. Still, I cannot help at the very outset acknowledging the pleasure I experience at finding myself once more in this good parish of Somerset.

Among the addresses presented to me to day, I am free to say that there is one which has particularly touched me. I refer to that coming from my old fellow citizens, if I can call them so, from my old friends of Somerset. In it, there is one sentence especially which I can never forget; it is that stating that the citizens of Somerset have always regarded me as a brother. Indeed, I can say that, during the twenty years I have known the fine parish of Somerset, I have been always treated rather as a brother than as a stranger. It is now twenty years since I put my foot in this village for the first time, and since then I have very often been here on professional business, during the happy period when my profession alone claimed my attention; I have also come here many times since I have embraced the political career, the fact being that, in all the elections since 1867, there was only one in which I did not take part, and that was the last, when my friend, Mr. Turcot, won so glorious a victory.

On my arrival at the station some of my old

Somerset friends were good enough to tell me that they very much regretted my absence from the county at the last election. This was very kind and flattering on their part. But I am certain that no matter what I might have done I could have added nothing to the triumph of my friend, Mr. Turcot. Still, I would have been glad to have been able to be present, if only to revive the old associations which have always bound me to the parish of Somerset.

This is my first visit to Somerset since the disastrous fire which swept this village two years ago. And what a transformation has been effected! Indeed, no one in the world, unless he was previously acquainted with the Somerset people, could understand how this fine village, which was only a heap of ashes, has risen so rapidly from its ruins.

I am happy to note that, in the rebuilding of this village, party spirit was forgotten. I know that, at election times, it has its Liberals and Conservatives, but I also know that, after the elections, there are no more Liberals or Conservatives,

ROUGES OR BLEUS.

And, in this connection, it occurs to me to ask myself, gentlemen, if by any chance there remain any old Bleus in the township of Somerset? And this time, if we were speaking at the place we used to speak formerly, I would place my hands over my eyes and ask myself if there remained any old Bleus; I do not think there is one remaining.

Well, the time has arrived to put our shoulders to the wheel and to work together to raise the country as you have raised this village from ruin.

Gentlemen, I owe you thanks for the welcome you are giving me to-day; I thank my friends who have flocked here, so to say, from all parts of the country. I see among them people from the old county of Arthabaska, which I long had the honor to represent; I see friends from my own native place, with

whom I went to school, and I see people from the division which I now have the honor to represent, friends from Quebec East.

I thank all for coming here; I specially thank my friends of Somerset, for having taken the initiative in this magnificent demonstration; and I also return my thanks to my friends of the county of Arthabaska for the beautiful address which they presented to me. In fact, I think it would be impossible for an address to express warmer sentiments.

I do not blame any one, where every one thought he did his duty, but I do not hesitate to say to the electors of the county of Arthabaska that, when they rejected me in 1877 and that the signal honor was conferred upon me of being called to represent what I believe to be the most patriotic constituency in the country, the division of Quebec East, they rendered me, perhaps, a great service.

My friends, you all congratulate me upon my selection to henceforward guide the destinies of

THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA.

You congratulate me, gentlemen, on this circumstance, but I deplore it and you also, I am sure, deplore the sad event which has deprived the Liberal party of the leadership of a man like the Honorable Edward Blake.

The loss of Mr. Blake, gentlemen, is an irreparable loss to the party which he directed with so much wisdom, grandeur and brilliancy, irreparable to the party which followed him with so much devotion and affection, and irreparable to the country to whose interests he gave his intelligence, his health and his time and which, I must say, repaid the sacrifice so badly.

You congratulate me, gentlemen. I must, however, acknowledge that it was with the greatest repugnance that I accepted the position which was offered to me by my friends in the House of Commons. As

Heaven is my witness, gentlemen, I never sought or coveted that position; my friends, deeming me worthy of it, gave it to me; but, for my part, I never desired it, not feeling in myself the qualifications for it; I would have much preferred to continue in the role which I had until then filled, that of a free lance of the Liberal party, taking part in the fight when my feelings impelled me in that direction, rather than to accept the heavy responsibility which I must now bear as leader. Nevertheless, I stifled my objections, believing it to be my duty to accept the post since my friends insisted on it. I considered that the services which we owe to one another made it a duty for me to take in my party the most exposed post, since

THE MOST EXPOSED POST

was assigned to me.

You congratulate me, gentlemen, and you congratulate the French Canadians on the election of a French Canadian as leader of the great Liberal party of the Dominion of Canada.

I must do this justice to my honorable colleagues of the English tongue in the House of Commons, to Sir Richard Cartwright, to Mr. Davies, to Mr. Mills and to a host of others, who had more claims than I had to the position of party leaders—I must do them the justice to say that they do not seem to remember that we are not of the same origin or, if they do remember it, it is only to affirm, by their acts as by their words, that, in the ranks of the Liberal party, there is no question of race, but that all are equal.

Undoubtedly, gentlemen, I am a man, and men, as you know, have their sympathies and their preferences. But I will say with the Latin poet: "*Homo sum et humani nihil a me alienum puto*"; "I am a man and I should be a stranger to nothing human" and, as a friend in the crowd said a moment ago, I am a French Canadian, with all the pride of my race, but all the rights of the British constitution are as dear to me as

those of my race—and, if the occasion ever arose that the rights of our separated brethren were assailed, I would defend them with as much energy and conviction as I would those of my own race. The manner might, perhaps, not be the same, but the impulse most assuredly would be. It may seem idle to enunciate truths as certain as this one, but there is now more than ever occasion to recall it, because I regret to say that between us—and I do not confine my remarks to the province of Quebec, but apply them to the entire Confederation—the prejudices of race and creed have increased in bitterness since the tragic events which have ensanguined the North-West.

With a zeal worthy of a better cause, a certain portion of the Ontario press has been doing its best to divide the Catholics from the Protestants, and I regret to say that in our own province these attacks are often repelled by means fully as reprehensible.

Whether they come from the Catholics of Quebec or from the Protestants of Ontario, appeals to prejudice are equally deplorable. For my part, I have as much aversion for the man who appeals to Catholic prejudices in the province of Quebec, as for the man who appeals to Protestant prejudices in the province of Ontario.

The true patriot, gentlemen, is a stranger to flattery—he only knows justice. The true patriot always uses the same language, whether he addresses himself to the Protestants of Ontario or to the Catholics of Quebec. The true patriot has only one measure, that of justice,justice to whom justice is due.

Has not this more than anything else characterized the political career of Honorable Edward Blake? Neither for the possession of power, nor for any other motive, did Mr. Blake ever stoop to appeal to prejudices; if he had a defect, it was the defect of great souls and grand characters, but we do not call it a defect, but a sovereign quality and it dominated his nature.

THE CAUSE OF THE WEAK AND THE OPPRESSED

attracted him, so to say, instinctively. Where is the man of our race who has defended with more energy and vigor than Mr. Blake the cause of the half-breeds driven to revolt and crime by the injustice of a perverse Government?

Where is the son of Ireland on this continent who has defended the cause of that unhappy country with more eloquence and logic?

French Canadians, I ask you one thing—that, while, remembering that I, a French Canadian, have been elected leader of the Liberal party of Canada, you will not lose sight of the fact that the limits of our common country are not confined to the province of Quebec, but that they extend to all the territory of Canada and that our country is wherever the British flag waves in America.

I ask you to remember this in order to remind you that your duty is simply and, above all, to be Canadians. To be Canadians! that was the object of Confederation in the intention of its authors; the aim and end of Confederation was to bring the different races closer together, to soften the asperities of their mutual relations, and to connect the scattered groups of British subjects. This was the programme twenty years ago. But are the divisions ended? The truth is that after twenty years' trial of the system, the Maritime provinces submit to Confederation, but do not love it. The province of Manitoba is in open revolt against the Dominion Government, gentlemen, not in armed revolt, like the revolt of the half-breeds, but in legal revolt. The province of Nova Scotia demands its separation from the Confederation. In fact, carry your gaze from east to west and from north to south, and everywhere the prevailing feeling will be found to be one of unrest and uneasiness,

OF DISCONTENT AND IRRITATION.

Such, gentlemen, is the picture which unrolls

itself to-day to our eyes after twenty years of the regime of Confederation. It will be said, perhaps, that this picture is overdrawn. I appeal to the sound good sense of my present hearers; unfortunately, the picture is only too realistic. And yet, it is perfectly true that, if this be the painful state of things which we have to note, the fault does not rest with the institutions, but with the men by whom we are governed.

The fault does not rest with the institutions under which we are governed, because they are excellent, and, for my part, I at once declare, in my quality as leader of the Liberal party, that I propose to do all in my power to inculcate love and respect for the institutions under which we live; those institutions, gentlemen, are excellent. I am a British subject; I am of the French race; I have proclaimed the fact in the province of Ontario and I am happy to proclaim it again to-day before countrymen of my own race and mother tongue. I am proud of my allegiance.

I shall not stop to discuss the question so often a subject of controversy among ourselves as to the manner in which we became British subjects. Did we become British subjects by conquest or by cession? There is no difficulty in the matter for me, and no more, on history than on contemporary events, have I any desire to conceal my way of thinking. If Montcalm had not lost the battle of the Plains of Abraham, the Chevalier de Levis would not have capitulated and the treaty of Paris would never have been signed. That is the position. But I state here before my brethren of the French language and before my brethren of the English tongue that we have made

A GREATER AND A MORE GLORIOUS CONQUEST

than any territorial conquest; we have conquered our liberties, and, if the event of to-day has any meaning, we can affirm without fear of mistake that we owe it to the acquisition of our civil and political liberties. We form part of the British Empire,

we are British subjects ; and remember, gentlemen, all the dignity and pride that were involved in the title of a Roman citizen, at the beginning of the Roman era when St. Paul, loaded with chains and on the point of being subjected to unworthy treatment, had only to exclaim : " I am a Roman citizen " to be treated with the respect to which he was entitled. We are British subjects and should be proud of the fact ; we form part of the greatest empire on the globe and are governed by a constitution, which has been the source of all the liberties of the modern world. I even go further and make bold to say that I am an admirer of our constitution. Undoubtedly, it is not perfect ; it has serious defects which my friend, Honorable Mr. Mercier, will be called upon to soon correct at the interprovincial conference. And, speaking as I do, I state my personal ideas. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that the principle of our Confederation, that is to say, the principle of the separation of the legislative powers, is a source of privileges for us if we know how to properly avail ourselves of it. But, unfortunately, gentlemen, we have not known how to do so thus far. However, as I said a moment ago, if there is discontent amongst us, if there is irritation from one end of the province to the other, the fault rests with the men who have governed us ; the fault rests with the men, who, instead of governing according to the spirit of our institutions,

HAVE DISREGARDED THE PRINCIPLE OF LOCAL LIBERTIES

and local interests, the recognition of which lies at the very basis of our constitution. The evil dates from afar, it is true - from the very origin of Confederation. I referred a short time since to the case of Nova Scotia, which demands to go out of the Confederation, into which it was dragged by force. Well, to bring back Nova Scotia into Confederation, the most elementary principles of justice and of all constitutional liberty were violated.

Nova Scotia did not want Confederation and desired to remain, as previously, an English colony; but her rights were disregarded and against her will she was forced into the Canadian Confederation. I am therefore not astonished that Nova Scotia still feels just as sore as she did on the first day, though twenty years have elapsed since then, and the reason of this is that all the promises that were made to Nova Scotia and New-Brunswick, that is to say, to the Maritime provinces, to induce them to enter the Confederation, have been odiously broken. They were promised a moderate tariff such as they had until then lived under. And instead of the moderate tariff they were promised, the tariff, which existed at that time, has been since doubled, tripled and even in some cases quadrupled. And for what purpose? For the purpose, gentlemen, of depriving the Maritime provinces of their natural trade, of the legitimate trade which they had enjoyed until then, for the purpose of destroying the trade which they had with the United States and to force them to trade with the west. The Government policy was triumphant on this point; it worked to a charm in destroying the trade of the Maritime provinces with the United States, but it failed to create a trade for the Maritime provinces with the west, because, if you can legislate on tariff questions, you cannot

LEGISLATE AGAINST GEOGRAPHY.

The Maritime provinces are very much in the same position as the unhappy Tantalus, who was seated at a table loaded down with delicious meats and yet could not touch them, because every time he stretched out his hand to do so, the table moved away from him. So it is with the Maritime provinces. They have a market open to them at their very doors - the market of the New England States—and they cannot avail themselves of it. They have a well dressed table before them, but they can never touch it.

But, you will tell me that the Maritime provinces support the Government. I regret to say that it is true that they support Sir John's Government. But at what price? At the price of millions taken out of the public chest and distributed among them.

In order to carry the Digby election, by a majority of 28 to 30 votes, the Government were obliged to spend not less than $58,000 I hold in my hands the documents establishing the fact.

The people of the Maritime provinces do not object to the money which the Government distributes among them and ready take the purse which is held out to them, but they continue none the less to reject the hand that is profered to them, saying: Since we are in the Confederation against our wishes, let us make all we can out of it; but Confederation will never receive our love; it will have our votes,

BUT OUR HEART, NEVER!

The end of these prodigalities is now drawing near and, when it comes, what will happen? The existing discontent will continue to exist and when the means which have been used to allay it no longer exist, the discontent will then spread more widely and when it has permeated the whole social body, it may be asked, to use John Howe's expressions: "What next?" What will happen? I do not know, but the question is one which should claim the thoughts of public men and I cannot help believing that the men who are today at the head, Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues, should give it a thought. But, if Sir John Macdonald does so, it must be after the fashion of Louis XV with regard to the State of France, when his throne was tottering and when his reply to those who spoke to him on the subject was: "Oh! after all, it will last long as I last." This appears to be the policy of the present Government; it will last as long as Sir John Macdonald and when Sir John Macdonald disappears,

AFTER HIM THE DELUGE!

I shall not allude to the causes of the discontent that prevails or rather that prevailed not long since in the North-West, as my object is not to indulge in recriminations. I do not allude to the discontent which prevailed in the North-West, because the North-West has done justice to itself. It had grievances and the Government was forced to recognize and redress them. And since the question is ended, gentlemen, all I will say to-day is that it only remains for me to hope that the Government will hereafter give the fullest satisfaction to the people of the North-West and endeavor to repair all the harm it has done them. But, if there is no longer reason to speak of the cause of discontent in the North-West, there is certainly reason to speak of the causes of the discontent now prevailing in the province of Manitoba.

Gentlemen, the province of Manitoba is not peopled by half-breeds alone as is the North-West; its population on the contrary is composed of the most civilized elements furnished by the most civilized peoples of the Old World. And yet, at this present hour, it is an undeniable fact that the province of Manitoba is in revolt against us, not against us as a people, but against the Canadian Government. Legal revolt, if you will, but revolt, certainly, open revolt against the authority of the Canadian Government. And if the province of Manitoba is in revolt to-day against the authority of the Canadian Government, it is because the Canadian Government has not known how or rather has not desired to respect the legislative independence of the province of Manitoba. Legislative independence is the basis of our constitution and, to my mind, the principle *par excellence* of government. We are all Federalists. At the time of Confederation, Sir John Macdonald declared that for his part he was theoretically in favor of a legislative union, that is to say, that he wanted, as he said himself, only one Parliament and one Government; but,

in the face of the state of things which existed in the provinces and their hostility to a legislative union, he was obliged to accept a federative union. In a country like ours, with a heterogeneous population, a separation of powers is absolutely necessary. I go further and say that even to govern a homogeneous people, when that people are scattered over a vast territory, a separation of powers is also necessary. In that case, legislative union would necessarily lead to tyranny; and

A FEDERATIVE UNION IS THE ONLY ONE

which can secure civil and political liberty.

Take, for example, gentlemen, our neighbors of the United States. Suppose that in that country there was only one Parliament, can it be believed for a moment that the neighboring republic would have attained to the present high degree of prosperity, which it has known under its system of federative government? The same argument holds good with respect to our own country. Even though climatic influences were the only motive, it is a recognized fact that the ethnographic characteristics of a same race vary according to the climates. The man of the South, the man of the East and the man of the West in the United States exhibit traits and manners peculiar to each, so that it is perfectly obvious that these different classes of men must have different wants, that Texas and Maine, Louisiana and Massachusetts have different local requirements and that California and Rhode Island have not the same local wants. Could a single power satisfy all these local interests? Would one Parliament be sufficient for the purpose. In fact, is it not manifest that to meet all these local wants, local legislatures are an absolute necessity? Suppose that there was only the Congress, and it will be found certain that in some places its legislation would weigh arbitrarily; there would be discontent, and instead of the harmony which we see reigning among our

neighbors, there would be acrimony and, instead of the prosperity prevailing all over, there would be only poverty and ruin. Now, what is true of the United States is equally true of our own country. Our situation is excellent and we have further what they have not—a less homogeneous people than theirs. It is evident that, in our province, we have not the same wants as the province of Manitoba. So that it must be perfectly clear to all that the moment local wants arise, the federative principle which makes the distinction between local interests to and general interests, is the only system by which men can be governed in all liberty. If this principle be true, gentlemen, and I think it is so, it necessarily follows that the federative principle, legislative separation, is

THE MOST POWERFUL FACTOR IN NATIONAL UNITY.

Legislative union does not respond to local wants and must necessarily press tyrannically somewhere, thus creating the desire for complete separation, while the legislative separation of the provinces respects the rights and conduces to the happiness of all. As I have already told you, gentlemen, Sir John Macdonald was theoretically favorable to a legislative union. The necessities of the hour, however, made him a supporter of a federative union, but you know the French poet's saying:

Chassez le naturel, il revient au galop. (1)

In the case of Sir John Macdonald, the natural came back at a galop, nay, at a triple galop. Since 1878, Sir John Macdonald's natural has got the upper hand and not a year has passed since that date which has not witnessed an attack by Sir John on the autonomy of the provinces. The license act, the railway act the franchise act, are there to testify to Sir

(1) (Chase the natural, and it comes back at a galop.)

John Macdonald's centralizing ideas and to promote his encroachments on the rights of the Local Legislatures. But fortunately all these attacks have not succeeded; if they had, we would have a federative government in name, but a legislative union in reality and Sir John would be absolute master of all the provinces, of the province of Quebec, of the province of Ontario, and of all the other provinces from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Unfortunately, the constitution by which we are governed and for which, as already stated, I have the greatest respect, has placed in the hands of the Government a terrible weapon which it has used, when and how it pleased, to assail the local liberties of the provinces. This weapon is the veto power, which is reserved to the Government by the constitution. Section 56 of the British North America Act provides that the British Parliament shall have the power to disallow the acts passed by the Parliament of Canada. And section 90 gives the same power to the Central Government, to the Government of Canada, over the acts passed by the Local Legislatures. Sir John Macdonald has taken advantage of this power to exercise a system of tyranny over all the provinces. There are two kinds of disallowance:

THE JUDICIAL DISALLOWANCE AND THE POLITICAL DISALLOWANCE.

The judicial disallowance is exercised when a law is transmitted to the central power and the Minister of Justice is of opinion that it is not within the powers of the Local Parliament; in such case, he makes a report to the Executive Council that it is *ultra vires* and it is disallowed on that report, that is to say, that, from that moment, it becomes null and void.

Gentlemen, this mode is not satisfactory; indeed, it is one of the most arbitrary things under the sun. When a law has been passed by a Local Legislature,

there is just as much reason to suppose that it is within the powers of that legislature, as there is reason to suppose that it is not, because it has pleased the central government to declare it so. This provision does not exist in the American constitution and the fact is that it very often happens, that it has very often happened, that the central government, on the simple pretext that a law is not within the powers of a local legislature, has vetoed that law, although it has since been established that it was *intra vires* of the Provincial legislature.

I see by an extract from the *Official Gazette* that the Government of Canada has just disallowed the law passed by the Quebec Legislature in 1886 and entitled "An Act respecting the executive power". The disallowance of this act is couched in the following terms:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, OTTAWA

Tuesday, 19th day of July, 1887.
His Excellency the Governor General in council

Whereas the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec with the Legislative Council and Assembly of that province did, on the 21st day of June, A. D. 1886, pass an act which has been transmitted, intituled "an act respecting the Executive Power."

And whereas the said act has been laid before the Governor General in council, together with a report from the Minister of Justice, setting forth that he is of opinion that it was not competent for the legislature to pass such act, and therefore recommending that the said act be disallowed.

His Excellency the Governor-General has thereupon this day been pleased by and with the advice of his Privy Council to declare his disallowance of the said act, and the same is hereby disallowed accordingly.

Whereof the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Quebec and all other persons whom it may concern are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

JOHN J McGEE,
Clerk, Privy Council.

I, Sir Henry Charles Keith Petty Fitzmaurice, Marquis of Lansdowne, Governor-General of Canada, do hereby certify that the act passed by the legislature of the province of Quebec on the 21st day of June, 1886, and intituled "an act respecting the executive power" was received by me on the 20th day of July, 1886.

Given under my hand and seal this 16th day of July, 1887.

LANSDOWNE.

For my part, gentlemen, without knowing the facts any more than I do, I am inclined as much to believe that the legislation placed on the statute book by Mr. Mercier's predecessor, Mr. Taillon, who was then Attorney General, was within the attributes of the Local Legislature, as I am disposed to believe that it is not within those attributes because it has pleased Mr. Thompson to declare that it is not.

The Minister of Justice may be right or he may be wrong. If he is wrong, gentlemen, he deprives the province of the benefit of a law which its Legislature has deemed essential to its administration, and it is not thus that a Confederation should be worked. It would be much better

TO ADOPT THE AMERICAN SYSTEM,

that is to say, to leave the power of disallowance to the law courts. But there is more than this, gentlemen. There is the political veto which is by far the most arbitrary weapon with which tyranny has ever armed a federative government.

According to this system, a law passed by a Provincial Legislature, even when entirely within its powers, may be disallowed and annulled, whenever it pleases the Government of Sir John Macdonald. In a word, it completely destroys the legislative independence of the provinces and it is the exercise of such tyrannical powers which has driven the province of Manitoba to revolt. That province is a province whose chief product is wheat, and it therefore has need of railways to forward it to the foreign markets. It

has two roads, both under the control of the Canadian Pacific Company, which charges exorbitant rates of freight. And the moment that these rates weighed so heavily that there was no longer any profit left in wheat-growing in Manitoba and that the entire population rose, as one man, to demand what they had a right to demand, that is to say, additional rail communications, the Local Legislature of the province, to meet their urgent requirements, passed a number of charters to establish lines of railway between the city of Winnipeg and the American boundary line. Thereupon, the Ottawa Government, availing itself of the arbitrary power I have just denounced, vetoed these acts as fast as they were passed. This conduct, gentlemen, involved not only an act of tyranny, but

A SYSTEMATIC VIOLATION

of its word by the Government. We have a proverb in French which says: "Frank as the word of a King."

When it is said that: "The King's word has been given," all has been said. The King's word was given by Sir John Macdonald, but the King's word was broken by Sir John Macdonald's Government. Sir John had given his word in 1881. At that time, the monopoly was to apply simply within the territories controlled by the Government of Canada and not in the province of Manitoba. The law itself on this point is unequivocal, and Sir John Macdonald's own declarations are not equivocal either. On that occasion, Sir John said:

> In order to give them (the C. P. R.) a chance, we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—(mind you, the Dominion Parliament; we cannot check any other Parliament; we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba) shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence.

As you can perceive, Sir John Macdonald did not then pretend that he could control the province of Manitoba, the province of Quebec, or the province of Ontario. On the contrary, he distinctly stated that the Government of Canada had no right to control the legislature of any province, and a gentleman, who was then one of the most eminent members of the House of Commons and who is now a member of Sir John Macdonald's Government, Honorable Mr. White, declared in still more categorical terms that the Government had no right to control the Government of Manitoba. He said:—

But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles' clause there never can be any railway in that country. To what does that apply? Simply to the territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter for a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organization to build a railway from Winnipeg to West Lynn on the boundary and, after this agreement is ratified, this provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses; in fact, the Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the province itself and there is nothing to prevent the province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract is that their traffic shall not be tapped far west in the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from their line to a foreign line, but there is nothing to prevent a railway to be built in Manitoba within the province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side. That is the position with respect to this matter.

What does this clause apply to? Simply to the territory over which the Government of Canada had control. There is no possible room for doubt on this head.

In the minds of the authors of the Pacific contract themselves, the Government of Canada had no power

to disallow the laws of the province of Manitoba and yet, on four or five different occasions, Sir John Macdonald's Government has disallowed laws by which the Manitoba Government sought to establish railway communications.

What happened? The Government of the province of Manitoba, the Government of Sir John Macdonald's friend, Mr. Norquay, was itself obliged to take the initiative in passing a new law to incorporate a railway from the city of Winnipeg to the American boundary line. And, in spite of that law, in spite of the public opinion of the province of Manitoba, Sir John Macdonald's Government again vetoed it. He vetoed Manitoba's right to have

RAILWAY COMPETITION

and I call the special attention of all who blame the half-breeds for resorting to arms to the actual situation in Manitoba.

The people of Manitoba, it is true, have not taken up arms, but, at this moment, they are openly breaking and setting at defiance the law of the land, since that law, as it stands or is defined by the constitution, declares that, by the will and authority of the Government of Canada, the people of Manitoba have not the right to build railways,and yet for all that, at this very hour, they are building one. If this is not revolt, what is it then? If it is not a revolt, gentlemen, I want to be told what it is? And, after all, who will blame the people of Manitoba? The very Government, which has sought to control them and to impose upon them its tyrannical yoke, has been obliged to yield and retreat. Why? Because it knows that the people of Manitoba are able to take the necessary measures to successfully defend themselves.

This right of veto which the Government possesses over the Provincial Legislatures is the same as that possessed by the British Government over the Canadian Parliament. That is to say, that the British

Government has over the Government of Canada the same rights as the Government of Canada has over the Provincial Legislatures. But, though Confederation has now been in existence for very close upon twenty years, I have no recollection—and my memory is a pretty good one—of the British Government ever having disavowed a single Canadian law during those twenty years. I make a mistake: I now remember that the British Government disallowed one law passed by Canada, but it was a law which had been passed by the Canadian Parliament to enable the committee appointed to enquire into the Pacific scandal to examine witnesses under oath. That law was disallowed by the British Government

AT THE DEMAND OF SIR JOHN MACDONALD HIMSELF.

It was only when Sir John Macdonald asked the British Government to annul our legislation that that Government intervened, never otherwise. And for a good reason, because the British Government would not be guilty of the tyranny, of which Sir John Macdonald's Government is guilty towards the provinces. More, too, the Government of Canada would never stand from the British Government the tyranny to which Sir John Macdonald's Government is subjecting the people of the provinces. Sir John vetoes the acts creating railways in Manitoba on the ground that those laws are not in harmony with the policy of Canada. But if the Government of Great Britain proposed to veto a Canadian law on the pretext, gentlemen, that it did not square with the policy of Great Britain, I have no hesitation in saying that the Tories themselves would be constrained to protest against the British Government's interference.

The Tories are very loyal in this country, at least, as far as lip-loyalty goes. But, in 1879, the Tory Government adopted a fiscal policy, which not only did not square with the general fiscal policy of Great Britain, but was openly hostile to the policy of

Great Britain. And when the Grits of Ontario contended that that policy would endanger the colonial tie, the Tory answer was: "So much the worse for the colonial tie!" From this you can judge what would happen if the British Government thought proper to meddle in the affairs of Canada. We should not do unto others what we would not like to have done to ourselves. And just as the Tories would not be very pleased to see the British Government stepping in to veto their laws, so we can demand that the Federal Government shall

NOT INTERFERE IN OUR LOCAL AFFAIRS.

My friend, Mr. Mercier whom I am glad and whom you are all happy to see at my side here to day, Mr. Mercier, who comes amongst us with his laurels still fresh from the Laprairie victory, will tell you in a few moments that he is on the point of calling an interprovincial conference.

Without knowing exactly what his programme for that interprovincial conference is, I trust, gentlemen, that this question of disallowance will be among the subjects considered and that he and his colleagues will suggest an amendment to the constitution which will once for all put an end to the abuses of the veto power and close the door forever to the tyrannical acts which sir John Macdonald's Government is so prone to in order to attain its ends.

There is another question on which the conference will have to pronounce—the question of the provincial subsidies.

On this question, I believe, gentlemen, that I am in accord, indeed, as I have always been, with Mr. Mercier's views. The provincial subsidies are a cause of ever increasing uneasiness in the different provinces. The root of the evil lies in the fact that the mode of distributing these subsidies is altogether vicious. For my part, I may say that my personal opinion is rather opposed to the provincial subsidies.

I would like to see the provinces with revenues large enough to render them independent of the Federal Government. The principle under which one government collects the revenues and another government spends them is

ALTOGETHER FALSE,

and must always lead to extravagance. Notwithstanding all the confidence I have in him, I believe that my friend, Mr. Mercier himself, will have all the trouble in the world to contend against the erroneousness of that system. It is now an established fact that the subsidies granted to the provinces are inadequate; consequently they have on several occasions been augmented and these successive augmentations, made without any regard to rule, constitute in reality a system of corruption in the hands of the Federal Government and have been too often used by it to reward political treachery. I have confidence that Mr. Mercier's Government will suggest a better method. But, as the subject is one which will claim attention at the interprovincial conference, I shall not dwell further on it.

The Government's fiscal policy is another cause of public uneasiness. You all know the old saying: "Promise more butter than bread!" This was the tactic of the partisans of Sir John's Government at the elections of 1878. They told you that they had in their pockets an infallible panacea, the application of which would cause the land of Canada

TO FLOW WITH MILK AND HONEY;

something that would make you sell dearer all you had to sell and enable you to buy all you wanted to buy so cheaply that you might be said to get it for nothing at all; something, in fine, which would put bread in every mouth and money in every purse.

Recall, gentlemen, the promises that were made

to you at that time. You were told that the ills of the country proceeded from foreign competition. It was said: Only try our system, our "National Policy" and, from that moment, all who are obliged to seek work in the United States, will find it in plenty at home; manufactures will spring from the ground by enchantment, they will arise on all the rivers, on all the water courses and even on all the brooks and the farmer will have a remunerative local market for all he can sell.

I do not blame the people of this country for allowing themselves to be carried away by these fallacious promises, because they were alluring. They took them seriously and in good faith. But what has been the reality?

I ask if it is not true that.

THE CANCER OF EMIGRATION

is continuing more than ever its destructive work. I ask if it is not true—at least, it is my conviction—that there is not 10 per cent of Canadian families, who have not one or more of their members in the United States? And if I asked all those, who are listening to me at this moment and who have relations in the United States, to raise their hands, how many arms, gentlemen, would be raised, beginning with my own. (Cries of "Every one of us!") Yes, "every one of us." I therefore believe that I can again assert what I stated a moment ago—that there is not 10 per cent of the French Canadian population, who do not count some one of their kindred in the United States.

As regards agricultural products, you were also told that you would find a market here among yourselves and that, if you accepted the national policy, you would have markets all around you. Have you these markets at your doors? And with respect to the prices you receive for agricultural products, I venture to say - and on this point I do not fear con-

tradiction—that those products never sold at lower prices than they are selling at to-day. In fact, they are not sold; they are given away. Wheat, oats, barley, and other products command no remunerative price and are now disposed off cheaper than ever. The new order of things was to have produced a reaction. The reaction has come, gentlemen; it began in the province of Ontario; it has not stopped within moderate bounds; on the contrary, it has gone to extremes, and, at this very hour, the great majority of the Ontario farmers are clamoring for commercial union with the United States, that is to say, the suppression of all customs duties between the two countries.

For my part, gentlemen, I am not prepared to say that the advocates and adepts of commercial union have as yet very clearly defined their views. What lies at the bottom of the idea, what we see clearest in it, is the expression of a feeling in favor of reciprocity. The idea is badly defined, perhaps there is the feeling of which it but contains the germ; there is the conviction that any kind of reciprocity with the people of the United States would be to the advantage of the people of Canada. The reciprocity idea has always been

ONE OF THE ARTICLES OF THE LIBERAL PROGRAMME.

Formerly from 1854 to 1865, we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States and all are agreed in saying that that period was the finest and most prosperious in our history.

The credit of that treaty belongs entirely to the Liberal party and on this head I think I cannot do better than cite the evidence of Sir John Macdonald himself, when, three years ago, he said in the House of Commons:

In the first place there was the original reciprocity treaty which was finally consummated in 1854; the merit of that as far as Canada was concerned rested altogether with the administra-

tion of Sir Francis Hincks, the Liberal Government of that day, although the Government of which I was a member in 1854 had accidentally, from the retirement of Sir Francis Hincks, the duty of carrying out the treaty to its consummation, by introducing and carrying into law the act which ratified the treaty; still it was the merit of the Reform party and it was a great merit, for it did a great service to Canada.

Thus, even according to Sir John Macdonald's testimony, the merit of the reciprocity treaty with the United States belongs to the Liberal party. And, as he admits, it was no slight merit, because that treaty was of immense advantage to Canada. As you are aware that treaty came to an end in 1866. Sir John Macdonald was in power from 1866 to 1873, to the close of 1873; but did Sir John Macdonald

EVER RAISE A FINGER

to obtain its renewal? Never.

But, when Mr. Mackenzie came to power, the first thing, so to say, which he did, was to send an agent to Washington, Honorable George Brown, to negotiate with the American Government for a new reciprocity treaty. Mr. Brown performed the task; he succeeded in making a treaty to which the Government assented, but unfortunately it was not ratified by the American Government. Matters remained in this condition, but reciprocity was so popular that Sir John Macdonald himself, when he proposed the national policy, which, as I have already remarked, was to cause the land of Canada to flow with milk and honey, said that he was prepared to abandon it for reciprocity. Here are his own words:

That the Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thous-

ands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industry now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade and, moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade.

As you will perceive, Sir John Macdonald was ready

TO ABANDON THE NATIONAL POLICY

if. on their side, the American Goverument would grant us reciprocity. He even went further and declared to the House that, if we adopted the national policy, that is to say, the retaliation policy, the United States, whether it liked or not, would be obliged to grant us reciprocity.

In 1878, he again made the following statement:

There is no wrong in a reciprocity of tariffs if it is to our interests, but I am confident that one great object in having something like a retaliatory policy will be that if you are to have reciprocity in trade you will only get it in that way. They will not have anything like reciprocity of trade with us unless we show them that it will be to their advantage.—Why should they give us reciprocity when they have our markets open to them now? It is only by closing our doors and by cutting them out of our markets that they will open theirs to us.

There is Sir John Macdonald's statement. Retaliation alone could open the American market to us and during the same year, Sir Charles Tupper made a tour of the maritime provinces, proclaiming the same thing—that if we adopted a policy of retaliation the Americans would be compelled in less than two or three years to open their doors. That was the policy of the Federal Government—a policy of retaliation. The Federal Government told the people of Canada.

and they did so without smiling, though perhaps they smiled inwardly—that if they the people of Canada, numbering five millions of souls, closed their doors against a population of sixty millions, the latter would be soon so starved out that they would cry: "mercy! mercy! for the love of God, open your doors, or we will die of hunger!" During the following year,

THEY CARRIED OUT THEIR THREAT.

You are not without knowing, gentlemen, that the Americans would sooner suffer from hunger than open their doors to us under compulsion and that they would rather have no trade with us at all than appear to yield to our bullying; consequently, they have not been in any great hurry. And when the Government closed our doors against the American trade, they inserted in the act creating their fiscal policy a clause offering to admit all American agricultural products the moment that the Americans were prepared to admit ours.

Here is the clause in question:

VI—Any or all of the following articles, that is to say; Animals of all kinds, green fruits, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes, and other roots,) plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grains, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal, and oatmeal and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked) lard, tallow, meats, fresh salted or smoked, and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon proclamation of the Governor in council which may be issued, whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

For nine years now this bait has been dangling in the water, but the fish has not yet bitten at it; for nine years now, the Government of Canada has been

standing ready to throw open the Canadian markets to the Americans, if the Americans will only reciprocate by throwing open their markets to the Canadians, but the Americans, though they pass for being smart business people with a keen eye to their own interests, have not thought proper

TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OUR OFFERS.

Gentlemen, having thrown out their bait, the Government have since that time folded their arms and refused to make any other move. Further, they would not even raise a finger to renew the negotiations with the United States for the purpose of securing reciprocity. More than that, in 1884 Mr. Davies, of Prince Edward Island, made a motion, pointing out to the Government the urgency of reopening negotiations with the United States for a new treaty. It was as follows:

That, in view of the notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington given by the United States to the British Goverument and the consequent expiration on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of the Treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new Treaty providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries; and that in any such negotiations Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government.

Now, what was Sir John's reply to this proposal?

They (the United States) know that we are ready at any time; we have told them unmistakeably that we are ready at any time to renew the reciprocity treaty of 1854. They know perfectly well that we are quite ready to go on with the fishery arrangements made by the Washington Treaty on the same footing us they were before. They know perfectly well that Canada is

always open to enter into any reasonable arrangement with them and I think we ought to leave it there. I think it would do no good, I am satisfied it would frustrate any hope of entering into an arrangement with them if we passed this resolution. I do not now feel it right to say what the course of the Government would be. I think it would be premature to say what after due consideration and consultation with Her Majesty's Government may be done between now and July, 1885. I am quite satisfied the passing of the resolution declaring that we must enter into immediate negotiations because if that resolution passes we must do so, it will be an order of this House to enter into immediate negotiations for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty, would be simply to bring upon us the same rebuff we have got on so many previous occasions.

Such was Sir John Macdonald's declaration. But it went further. Not only was

A RETALIATION POLICY

affirmed by the speech I have just read, but it was also praised as an excellent policy. And the Government repeatedly declared that the aim of the tariff of 1879, of their fiscal policy, was to lessen and destroy the trade we were doing with the United States. Further still, the Ministerial press, the salaried press and consequently the press which reflected the ideas of the Ministers, declared that the people of Canada did not want any trade with the United States. Now, I ask you, gentlemen, if, in the face of this hostile attitude, it is astonishing that the American Government has never been willing to negotiate with us? Moreover, had it been otherwise, our Government would have done the same thing. Under such circumstances, I say that the policy of the Liberal party should be a totally different policy. The policy of the Conservative party is one of retaliation, but the policy of the Liberal party should be one of friendship and good will towards the United States. It is only by acting in this way that we can obtain an exchange of fair dealing and kindliness.

It is admitted—and the fact cannot be disputed—

that, if the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was advantageous to the interests of Canada, it was equally of advantage to the interests of the United States. Still the United States have deliberately refused to renew that treaty. Why? The reason is, gentlemen, that, during a period of trial for the American nation, the English people and the Canadian people did not show them

THE LEAST SYMPATHY.

I hold in my hand a speech made by Sir John Macdonald, on the 24th March, 1884, in which he acknowledges the fact. On the same occasion in 1884 to which I referred a moment ago, on Honorable Mr. Davies' motion, Sir John Macdonald used the following language:

> We regretted when the Americans, from I must say a rather natural feeling of irritation against England, gave notice for the cancellation and the termination of the Treaty. It was no fault of Canada that that Treaty was terminated. Canada during the troubles which arose in the civil war between the North and the South did every thing that she could to entertain friendly relations with the Northern States; and I can well remember the repeated statement of Mr. Seward who was the presiding genius of the Northern States in those days that he wished the mother country, Great Britain, had been as friendly in her actions towards the Northern States as the province of Canada had been.

As far as I am concerned, I may say that, if Mr. Seward was satisfied with the attitude of the Canadian Government towards the Northern States, during the civil war, it look very little to satisfy him. For my part, I would not have been satisfied with so little, as I do not believe that, on that occasion, the people of Canada did their duty towards their neighbors. It is true that we did not do as England did; that we did not fit out armed cruisers to prey upon and destroy American commerce, but, on the other hand, when

the filibusterers organized themselves in our territory to raid the frontier towns of Vermont and New-York, we allowed them to escape with singular facility after being arrested. Gentlemen, without holding the Government responsible for that incident I contend that they are guilty of having

FAILED IN THEIR DUTY

at that time, by not displaying the slightest sympathy with the American nation during the terrible period from 1861 to 1865, when the Northern States had on their hands the most formidable civil war the world has ever seen, for the preservation of their national unity.

Among the public men of the time there was only one—and this fact should be kept well in mind—who openly proclaimed his sympathies for the cause of liberty for which the Northern States were fighting from 1861 to 1865. That man was Honorable George Brown.

Gentlemen, if at that time the Government of Canada, if the people of Canada—for I think the people of Canada also merit to a certain extent the reproach—had manifested some sympathy—nothing more, for the United States were rich enough and had no need of assistance—if the people and Government of Canada had manifested the slightest sympathy, we especially who had a commercial treaty with them, if we had shown that that treaty implied also mutual services, I believe that in 1867 the reciprocity treaty would have been renewed. It was not, and I have just given you the reason why from the lips of Sir John Macdonald himself. It was the hostility of the American people to England, a hostility provoked by the attitude of the English people towards the Northern States during the civil war. But time moves on, healing the deepest wounds. We know that there is to-day in the United States a group of men determined upon giving us

COMMERCIAL UNION

We know that Mr. Butterworth, a member of the American Congress, has brought in a bill for that purpose. We know also that Mr. Wiman has lately visited Ontario to induce that province to adopt the idea of commercial union. We know that Detroit and other cities, as well as their trade organizations, have to a certain extent pronounced in favor of commercial union. If I am asked at present for my own opinion in the subject, I may say that, for my part, I am not ready to declare that commercial union is an acceptable idea. I am not ready, for my part, to state that commercial union should be adopted at the present moment. A great deal of study and reflexion are needed to solve this question, for and against which there is much to be said.

The commercial union idea may be realizable and it may also be surrounded by insurmountable difficulties. But I may say this—and it is my actual policy—that the time has come to abandon the policy of retaliation followed thus far by the Canadian Government, to show the American people that we are brothers, and to hold out our hands to them, with a due regard for the duties we owe to our mother-country. In certain quarters,

COMMERCIAL UNION WITH GREAT BRITAIN

has been advocated, which obliges me to refer to that proposition. Commercial union with Great Britain has been suggested as an alternative to commercial union with the United States. As far as I am concerned, I will say of commercial union with Great Britain what I have said of commercial union with the United States. I do not believe that so far the question has been practically discussed. Certainly, if it were realizable and all our interests were protected, I would accept a commercial treaty of that nature. It is permissible to suppose that this move-

ment would be taken up by all the countries which at the present day recognize the supremacy of Great Britain. Some years ago, in 1883 or 1884, I think, Mr. Rouher, one of the most eminent public men of France, said: At present, the world's equilibrium rests no longer, as on the past, on the Alps and the Pyrenees, but on the two hemispheres. What was true at that time in politics, is true to day in trade. The commerce of the world, which was formerly limited to the nations of Europe, now takes in the entire globe.

There is therefore room to suppose that all the nations recognizing the sovereignty of Great Britain, would agree to rally together by means of commercial treaties. With this object in view, delegates are now being sent to Australia. What would be easier than to open up a trade with Australia, than to have a commercial treaty with the Australian continent? Gentlemen, I consider the idea as good and fair, and, such being the case, I believe that it will eventually triumph.

Gentlemen, there is an infinity of other questions to which I would have liked to refer to-day, but, on an occasion like this, it is impossible to review all the political points which merit the attention of the people of Canada. I can do no more at present than touch lightly upon the difficulties, the solution of which seems to me to be urgently called for, and which delay will, perhaps,

NOT RENDER MORE REALIZABLE LATER.

Nobody can view without alarm the present state of things in this country, the sullen discontent, the growing irritation, at the system under which we have been ruled for close upon twenty years, and I submit to my fellow-countrymen of every origin and race that it is high time to put an end to the policy which has provoked this irritation, which has no other aim than the triumph of a party, and which sacrifices the country's dearest interests to a party triumph.

I submit to all my fellow-citizens that it is time to strive for the establishment of a policy which will make all the inhabitants of Canada feel happy to belong to this country. I submit to my fellow-countrymen that it is time to restore to the Maritime provinces all their rights, that is to say, their natural market. I submit that it is time to give to the province of Manitoba the exercise of all its privileges, and that it is time to give to all the provinces their complete legislative autonomy, so that they may exist in fact as they exist in law.

In fine, it is time to endeavor to obtain, if possible, for all the people of this country the most natural and at the same time the most profitable market.

Now, I state in concluding as I stated in commencing: I have faith in my country's institutions and I believe that, if they were well administered, they would engender a prosperity, the like of which we have not yet known.

For my part, I may say that as long as I shall occupy a place in the confidence of my party, as long as I shall fill a seat in the Legislature and as long as, by word and example, I can preach this doctrine, I shall devote my political life to spreading among my fellow countrymen,

THE LOVE OF OUR NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

I know that the task is a great one, and that I dare not hope to carry it to a successful issue myself. The most I can do is to trust that I may advance it a step —but at least the work is worthy of our efforts. And for my part, when the hour for final rest shall strike, and when my eyes shall close forever, I shall consider, gentlemen, that my life has not been altogether wasted, if I shall have contributed to heal one patriotic wound in the heart even of a single one of my fellow countrymen and to have thus promoted, even to the smallest extent, the cause of concord and harmony between the citizens of the Dominion.

Unlimited Commercial Reciprocity

WITH THE UNITED STATES

THE TORTURE OF TANTALUS

AN IMMENSE, BUT INACCESSIBLE MARKET AT OUR DOORS

THE PROGRAMME OF THE CANADIAN LIBERAL PARTY

In 1888, all the questionable schemes of an Americo-Canadian *zolverein* and of a commercial or customs union had given place to the idea of a renewal of the reciprocity treaty on the widest possible basis. The Liberal party in the Canadian Commons led for the first time by Mr. Laurier had adopted this policy as the foremost plank in its platform, and one of the finest debates ever heard in the Canadian Parliament had been provoked by a motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, involving a profession of faith in favor of unlimited reciprocity and representing the urgent necessity of resuming negotiations with Washington in order to secure a complete reciprocity of customs' tariffs. After his friends had piled up mountains of statistics, and arguments in support of the party's theory, Mr. Laurier summed up the debate in the following speech, which deserves to figure among the finest pieces of national eloquence:

MR. SPEAKER,

There is one feature which has universally characterized this debate, in so far as it has been partici-

pated in by our colleagues on the other side of the House. Again on this occasion, as on every other occasion, whether in the time of Reformers who have passed away or whether in the time of Reformers still living, the cause of reform has been met with the cry of disloyalty. It might be tempting to retaliate and to show what is the true inwardness of that exuberant loyalty which ever gushes forth from the other side of the House when facts or arguments are deficient to meet the case at issue. It might be tempting to retaliate and to show that

THE LOYALTY OF THOSE MONOPOLISTS

who to-day clamor the loudest, has no other foundation except the selfish one that the contemplated reform would put an end to a state of things, which, however lamentable it may be to the country, is eminently profitable to some individuals. It might be tempting to show that loyalty has always been, is, and always will be the last refuge, the supreme argument of those ingrained Tories who imagine themselves born to rule, and who, having long been associated with government, cannot contemplate the displacement of what government means for them—patronage, office, subsidies and monopolies—without thinking such a displacement would be rank treason. On the other hand, I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of those prophets of evil who, at every step taken forward by this young country, never fail to see an impending rupture of British connection, and whom a long series of sinister predictions, hitherto not fulfilled, has failed to make wiser or braver. Sir, I consider, it would be perfectly useless to attempt any argument upon those monopolists or ingrained Tories whose supreme end and object in politics is to enjoy the fleshpots of office and whose loyalty springs from the stomach, but to those well meaning though timid men who, inclined to a change, still dread change, I would at once say: You who object to reform because

you fear the good results will be accompanied by some evil result--are you satisfied with the condition of this country, that nothing is to be risked for its advancement? It is your opinion that, if there be to the south of us accessible fields of wealth, we should be deterred from the ennobling spirit of enterprise by the cowardly consideration that possibly increased prosperity would

SEDUCE US FROM OUR ALLEGIANCE?

Is yours the position of the man who would starve himself to death lest by eating food he might swallow poison? Away, away, I say, with ignoble fears and cowardly considerations. I also appeal to loyalty; I appeal to the loyalty of all we owe to our origin, to the blood that flows in our veins, to the example of our ancestors and the memories they have left behind them, and he, I say, who will stand truest to those examples will also stand truest in his allegiance to Queen and country. Let us remember that the great nation from which the greater number among us derive their origin, and from which we have the institutions on which we pride ourselves, is so great to-day because, at all periods of her history, her people never shrank from performing the duty which the hour demanded of them, without fear of the consequences to themselves or to the country. Let us remember that our country, if it has attained the proud position which to-day we claim it occupies, owes it to the unceasing efforts of reformers of former days, whose every effort was assailed with the same taunt of disloyalty that meets us to-day. Let us look at our position such as it is, let us look at our position squarely and manfully, and if the result is that our position to-day demands reform, let us, I say, strike for the reform, determined in advance that, if in this as in every other matter evil is to be mixed with good, it will be time to grapple with the evil when the evil arises. Once more, I say, let us look at our position, not such as it ought to be,

BUT SUCH AS IT IS,

not such as it is depicted in the speeches of Ministerial orators, but such as we hear it every day depicted in the unvarnished talk of the people. With a varied and fertile soil, with a healthy northern climate, with immense agricultural resources, with abundant mineral wealth, with unsurpassed lumber facilities, with the most productive fisheries in the world—this ought to be a land of universal prosperity and contentment. What is the position to-day? I said a moment ago that we have good reason to be proud of our country, proud of her people, proud of her history, proud of her institutions, proud of the position which she has already obtained among the nations of the world; but blind would he be who would fail to see that there is in her otherwise young and healthy body a deep wound that is depleting the very sources of life. When we contemplate that this young country with all her capabilities is losing her population, that every day hundreds of her sons are leaving her shores to seek homes in a country not more favored by nature than our own, the conclusion is inevitable that something is wrong which must engage the attention of every one for whom patriotism is not a vain and empty word. Yet with these facts full in view the Government, speaking by the mouth of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, invites Parliament to declare that there is absolutely nothing to do but to keep on the policy under which such a state of things is possible; and we have seen member after member of Parliament rise in his place and declare indeed that there is nothing to do, that everything is for the best. I will not lose one single moment in discussing that point, but I place the assertions made on this side of the House against those made by honorable gentlemen opposite, and leave the decision to the judgment of the people of the country, in the judgment of all the people without exception, and all, with the exception, perhaps, of the monopolists,

will say that there is something wrong in the condition of this country,

THAT THERE IS SOMETHING

which demands the attention of Parliament and of every one who claims to be a patriot. We have been told, and it is insisted on, that we are a prosperous country, that we are a happy country; and one honorable member, my honorable friend from Montreal Centre (Mr.Curran), if I remember aright, in dwelling on the great prosperity of this country, stated we had no starvation amongst us. Well, Sir, prosperity is a relative term applied to nations as well as to individuals. A man in private life may have affluence with a certain income in a certain condition of life, and yet be in want with the same income in a certain other condition of life; and so it is among nations. If you judge us, if you gauge the condition of this country by the standard of older continents, I would be quite ready to admit that we may be said to be a prosperous country. I grant this at once—and gentlemen opposite are welcome to the admission if they can find any comfort in it. We have no starvation in this country. We have not any threat of famine, we are not in the condition of China, in which country four provinces, some years ago, were carried away by hunger, and we are not in the condition of Ireland. We lose our people, but still we have not lost one third of our population, as Ireland did, in the space of two years. But, Mr. Speaker, the objection and the answer do not meet the point, nor do they meet the charge. To a young, healthy, energetic and active population on this continent, it is not sufficient that they should be

ABOVE STARVATION.

Their aim is higher. The charge is not, Sir, that there is a scarcity of natural productions, but the charge is, on the contrary, that there is an abundance of natural

productions, but that there is no issue and no outlet for the surplus beyond what the people consume. The charge is that manufacturing production is limited to our small and limited requirements, and, therefore, far below the producing capacity of the people. Sir, the people of this country have a right to expect that every child belonging to this country will, when he comes to manhood, find the same labor and returns for his labor, that he would find on the other side of the line. The people of this country, especially the tillers of the soil, have a right to expect that their labor will always command the highest price obtainable in the best and most favored markets of the world. They have a right to expect that the money which, by the necessities of their vocation, they are forced to invest in real estate will always retain its value; and when they find that there is no labor for every child born in this country, when they find that their labor is insufficiently remunerated, when they find that real estate does not keep up its value, but decreases in value, when they find that notwithstanding all attempts made we have not yet succeeded in having a population of 5,000,000 of people, and when they find that at least 1,000,000 of Canadian born children are to-day citizens of the United States, or are working in the United States, I say, again, that they must come to the conclusion that there is something wrong somewhere which has to be remedied. Under such circumstances there is to-day a sentiment of irritation and discontent which must be checked, or

IT MAY BECOME VERY SERIOUS

in a short time to come. We have been told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that what we say to-day is not new. The honorable the Minister of the Interior, speaking on that subject in answer to my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that the statements made by my honorable friend were not new, and that they had

been made in the elections of 1882 and 1887. Sir. it is perfectly true that those statements are not new. They were made in 1882. and they were made in the elections of 1887, and my honorable friend might further have added that they were made in the elections of 1878. He might have added that he and his friends came into power because from 1876 to 1878 they blamed the Government of the day for the emigration which, I admit, was then taking place. They blamed the Administration of my honorable friend on my left and stated that if they came into power they would put a stop to this emigration, and when they came into power they were pledged by their own words and their own writings to put a stop to that emigration. Now, Sir, in order to make that point more clear, let me refresh the memories of gentlemen on the other side about their speeches anterior to 1878, and I cannot do better than to quote the speech of my honorable friend. the leader of the Government and leader of the Opposition of that day. delivered at Parkdale, in the month of July, 1878. These are his very words :—

> Here we are not only suffering depression in every trade and industry, but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufactories of the United States.

An honorable member :— Read that again.

Mr. Laurier :— I will not read it again. but I will continue :—

> Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people, and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in those years and taken up their abode in the United States because they could not find employment here for their skill and energy and enterprise, in consequence of the false policy of our rulers.

Sir. if it was a crying shame in 1878, that 500,000 of our fellow-men should have crossed our borders to

the other side of the line, by what epithet strong enough can we characterize

THE POLICY OF THESE MEN

who, bound to put a stop to that sort of thing, and bound to stop that exodus, have brought it up from 500,000 to 1,000,000. I do not say this, Mr. Speaker, with any view of recrimination. I speak to say that the evil is one of long standing, which must tax our energy and for which we must find some remedy. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that there is discontent prevailing in this land. The causes are at once political and economical. There can be no doubt at all that, in the political aspect, a great deal of the discontent which prevails is largely due to the manner in which Confederation was forced on some sections of the country, and to the manner in which Confederation has been made a tool and an instrument in the hands of gentlemen on the other side to embarrass and to harass some other sections of the country. There can be no doubt that in the east of this Dominion the fact that one province at least was dragged into Confederation against her will, opened in the hearts of the people of that Province a wound which, after twenty years, is as galling as it was the first day. There can be no doubt at all that in the west the injust, the unfair, and the tyrannical manner in which the Constitution has been abused and violated by the Government, in order to force upon the people of that section of the country an abhorred monopoly, has created a bitterness in the hearts of those people which would have had the most fatal consequences, perhaps, if, fortunately, the Government, acting as they did yesterday in the matter of the admission of American importations upon the free list, had not in that other instance also

REVERSED THEIR POLICY

and surrendered. There is no doubt at all that in

the Province from which I come the numerous attempts made by the Government upon the political autonomy of the province have created distrust and disappointment in the minds of the people. And at the same time there can be no doubt, and we can readily believe it, that, if the country had been as prosperous as it is represented to be, a good deal of the discontent which now prevails would have been alleviated; for political causes alone seldom produce serious discontent, unless they affect injuriously the economic condition of the people. If our country had been as prosperous as it is represented to be, if Nova Scotia had found in Confederation the prosperity which was promised to be her lot in it, she would long ago have been reconciled to Confederation. If Manitoba had continued to enjoy the prosperity with which she opened her career, she would be to-day as cheerful a member of the Confederation as she was ten years ago. But all our efforts at increased prosperity have always been baffled. We never have had the measure of success which we expected from our efforts, and what is the reason? The reason is that we have not yet found the economical condition necessary to make the country as abundantly productive as it should be; that the consuming power of the nation is no adequate to its producing power; and that we have not yet found channels for the increased energy and activity of our people. Under such conditions, when the labor of the people will never yield as much as it would yield under a different economical condition, it is imimpossible to expect that there will be contentment in the land, or pride in the institutions of the country. The lumberman, the farmer and the manufacturer toil, but their efforts are comparatively barren; and if you ask them what is the economical condition they want in order to make their efforts as fruitful as they should be, they will tell you, that it is space,—

A BROADER FIELD,

in which to operate. The fisherman will tell you that if he could send his fish free to Boston and Portland, he would ask nothing more: the farmer will tell you that if he could send his productions to the cities and towns on the other side of the line, which are almost within arm's length, he would ask nothing more; the lumberman will tell you that if he had access to that immense range of territory which needs the products of our forest, he would ask nothing more; and the manufacturer will tell you--the genuine manufacturer,not the monopolist—that all he asks, is a fair field and no favor, and that if you remove the barriers which stand in his way, he is ready to compete with the Americans in their own market. During the last summer Mr. Butterworth, who is well known in this country, and who has taken the same view that we take as to the trade relations that should exist between Canada and the United States, speaking on this question in Detroit, made a remark which seemed to me at the time to be singularly true historically. He said this:

> The history of all nations has been a record of their efforts to broaden the area of their trade and commerce.

The more we think of this remark, the more we shall be convinced that it is eminently true. Indeed, the records of mankind show that, as soon as a nation has obtained its freedom, the energy of the people, which had hitherto been consumed in political agitation, is at once turned to labor and industry. Very soon the producing power of the people exceeds their consuming power,

NEW CHANNELS HAVE TO BE SOUGHT,

and from that time the history of that nation becomes a record of efforts to broaden the area of trade and commerce. Such was the history of the Italian republics in the middle ages, after they obtained their freedom. They gradually extended their trade beyond

the walls of their cities until it covered all the lands washed by the Mediterranean and the neighboring seas. Such was the history of Holland in the seventeenth century. After she had freed her neck from the yoke of Spain, although having a population of only 2,000,000, she gradually developed the largest trade of the age. Such was the case with England. For many years the English people were absorbed in political agitation, and during those years their trade did not increase; but having at last curbed the power of the Throne, asserted the supremacy of Parliament, and secured her political freedom, from that time the history of England became a record of the broadening activity and energy of the British people. The trade of England increased its area until it subdued continent after continent, and to-day it has no limits but the limits of the earth. The history of other nations has been our history. For years and years our people were absorbed in a political agitation for freedom, and during those years the country made but little progress; but when at last we obtained responsible government and legislative independence, what took place elsewhere happened here. The energy of the people, which had been previously absorbed in fruitless political agitation, was turned to toil and labor, and from that moment we had to seek for channels and outlets for our surplus energy. The forest, the mine and the sea are the fields to which the labor of our people has been directed. Ours is

ABOVE ALL AN AGRICULTURAL COUNTRY;

and, as we have abundance of lands at our disposal, vast tracts have been every year added to the cultivated soil; and, as the number of the tillers of the soil increased and the bulk of their productions became enlarged, there arose correspondingly a demand for new channels and outlets, and from that moment the history of this country became a history of efforts to broaden the area of our trade and commerce. If there

is one fact which more than any other has characterized Canadian politics since the concession of responsible government, it is that it has always been the efforts of the Canadian people to find new outlets and channels for their increasing energy. I do not mean to say that those efforts have been systematic or premeditated. On the contrary, they have been irregular and spasmodic, now in one direction and then in another, but they have been a continual and instinctive aspiration to pass from an unnatural to a natural economical position, just as a man who finds himself in a vitiated atmosphere will turn in every direction to get a breath of the fresh air without which he cannot live. As soon as the agitation for responsible government had abated, as soon as our friends, the Tories—who, loyal in those days as they are in these days, endeavored by riot, bloodshed and fire to intimidate Lord Elgin and prevent the establishment of the regime—had been forced to submit to the inevitable, the first act of the Government of the day—and it was

A LIBERAL GOVERNMENT—

was to seek new channels for the productive energies of the people. The Government found the natural channels of trade blocked and closed. There was to the south of us a great and progressive nation of kindred birth, from which we were separated by mountains of prejudice and some artificial barriers; and the efforts of the Government were directed to removing some of the barriers, and the result was the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which although limited in its operation and scope, everyone will admit the period of its duration marked the golden age of our trade and commerce. That was our first effort towards broadening the area of our trade and commerce. It was eminently successful. However, the treaty was of short duration. As soon as the limit of its term was reached, the American Government gave

notice that they would not continue it. Why? Was it because the treaty was not equally advantageous to the Americans? No; it is admitted that the treaty was just as advantageous to them as to us. The notice was given simply on account of the irritation caused in the United States by the unfriendly attitude maintained by England and Canada towards the United States during their great struggle for national life. That the repeal of the treaty was a blow to our commerce, no one has denied, and it has been the constant and unvarying effort of Canadian statesmen ever since to obtain a renewal of that treaty. Indeed, so much is that the case that, at a later day, when protection was adopted as the policy of this country, one of the reasons for its adoption was that thereby we might

FORCE THE AMERICANS

to give us reciprocity. The resolution that formulated the policy of the Government upon that occasion has often been quoted, but it will bear being quoted again, because it is pregnant with meaning in the face of the amendment of the Government on the present occasion. The resolution is as follows:—

> That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home.

How far that policy has been successful we all know, but no doubt honorable gentlemen opposite will say it has been in that respect eminently successful.

Mr. Landerkin:— It only sent a million away.

Mr. Laurier :— The resolution goes on as follows:

> That it will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving—as it ought to do—in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade.

Now, if I give an unfair construction to the words of my honorable friend, I will ask him to correct me in due time, but if words have any meaning, what was the meaning of the concluding paragraph of this resolution? Did it mean anything else but that, however desirable protection might be for Canada against other countries, reciprocity, so far as the United States were concerned,

WAS THE THING WHICH WAS DESIRED

and desirable? Now, Sir, in view of this resolution, I say that the amendment moved by the Government is not logical. What is the object of that amendment? Its object is to keep the national policy intact in its entirety. The final object of the national policy, as declared in the resolution I have just read, was to obtain reciprocity. It is evident that in this object it has not succeeded, and, therefore, the conclusion is unavoidable that something else must be tried. So ended our first effort to broaden the area of our trade and commerce. But that time we had something in contemplation. When notice was given of the abrogation of the treaty, the country was engaged in the discussion of the great question which ended in the Confederation of the Provinces, and there is no doubt whatever that in the minds of those who participated in the bringing about of that great event, the hope existed that Confederation would prove, not only a great political reform, but a great economical reform

as well. It was urged on the floor of Parliament at that time that the provinces, by adopting among themselves free trade, would find an adequate outlet and channel for their surplus energy. The honorable George Brown, who was at that time a member of the Coalition Government, enlarged upon that idea at great length and with great force. After having stated in the debate that

THE FIRST OBJECT OF CONFEDERATION

was to effect a great political reform, he went on to say:

...But secondly, I go heartily for the Union, because it will throw down the barriers of trade and give us the control of a market of 4,000,000 people. What one thing has contributed so much to the wondrous material progress of the United States as the free passage of their products from one State to another? What has tended so much to the rapid advance of all branches of their industry as the vast extent of their home market, creating an unlimited demand for all the commodities of daily use, and stimulating the energy and ingenuity of producers? Sir, I confess to you that in my mind this one view of the Union—the addition of nearly a million of people to our home consumers—sweeps aside all the petty objections that are averred against the scheme. What, in comparison with this great gain to our farmers and manufacturers, are even the fallacious money objections which the imaginations of honorable gentlemen opposite have summoned up? All over the world we find nations eagerly longing to extend their domains, spending large sums and waging protracted wars to possess themselves of more territory, untilled and uninhabited. Other countries offer large inducements to foreigners to emigrate to their shores—free passages, free lands, and free food and implements to start them in the world. We, ourselves, support costly establishments to attract immigrants to our country, and are satisfied when our annual outlay brings us 15,000 or 20,000 souls. But here, Sir, is a proposal which is to add in one day nearly a million of souls to our population—to add valuable territories to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing.

Now, everybody will admit that every word spoken here was perfectly true, that not one iota can be taken out of this passage as containing a single error. Still, the theory here advocated did not succeed, and it failed not because of any error that could be pointed at, but because of other circumstances which were overlooked at the time. I have quoted this in order to show that as far back as 1865, one of the master-minds, which the country has produced, was of opinion that it was essential to the trade of the country that we should add to the consuming power of our population. The same idea was enlarged upon by Mr. Galt in the same debate, and he stated, with all the authority which at that time attached to his name as Minister of Finance, that in Confederation he expected to find

A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMERICAN MARKET,

which we lost by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty He said:

...If we require to find an example of the benefits of free commercial intercourse, we need not look beyond the effects that have followed from the working of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. In one short year from the time when that treaty came into operation, our trade in the natural productions of the two countries swelled from less than $2,000,000 to upwards of $10,000,000 per annum, and now when we are threatened with an interruption of that trade—when we have reason to fear that the action of the United States will prove hostile to the continuance of free commercial relations with this country, when we know that the consideration of this question is not grounded on just views of the material advantages resulting to each country—but that the irritation connected with political events exercises a predominant influence over the minds of American statesmen, it is the duty of the House to provide, if possible, other outlets for our productions. If we have reason to fear that one door is about to be closed to our trade, it is the duty of the House to endeavor to open another to provide against a coming evil of

the kind feared, by timely expansion in another direction; to seek by free trade with our own fellow-colonists for a continued and uninterrupted commerce, which will not be liable to be disturbed at the capricious will of any foreign country.

Here, again, there is nothing to say against the theory that was then advanced, but the great expectations which were then entertained did not turn out to be true. Although every Government since that time has endeavored to bring together the east and west of Confederation, to bring about the interchange of the commodities of the east with those of the west, to-day we have not succeeded in developing any trade except a very insignificant one between the east and the west, and the glowing pictures which the men of 1865 drew as to what was to follow their endeavors to bring about that interchange of trade, have remained pictures. What was it that was left out, what was it that was omitted from their calculations? The fact which was omitted was, as has often been pointed out since, the geographicvl position of the different provinces of the Dominion. The men of 1865 forgot that no legislative act, no executive decree.

COULD SUPPRESS THE LONG DISTANCES

which separate the east from the west; they forgot that nature had interposed against profitable trade relations between the east and the west obstacles which no legislation could overcome. Sir, experience is the test of all theory, and, in the view of the experience which we have acquired during the last twenty years, let me show how deluded the men of 1865 were in regard to the hopes which they then entertained. Mr. McGee spoke in the same debate, and he emphasized the same idea which had been already expressed by Mr. Brown and Mr. Galt.and he particularized his meaning by instancing a particular trade. the coal trade of Nova Scotia. After having depicted,

in his glowing language, the coal fields of Nova Scotia, he went on to say:

> These exhaustless coal fields will under this plan—which is in fact our reciprocity treaty with the lower provinces—become, hereafter, the great resource of our towns for fuel. I see the cry is raised below by the anti-Unionists that to proceed with Confederation would be to entail the loss of the New England market for their coals. I do not quite see how they make that out, but even an anti-Unionist might see that the population of Canada is within a fraction of that of all New England put together, that we consume in this country as much fuel per annum as they do in all New England; and, therefore, that we offer them a market under the Union equal to that which these theorizers want to persuade their followers they would lose.

There is not a word to be taken from that passage. It is quite true that the population of Canada was as great as the population of all New England put together, and that Canada consumed as much fuel as the whole of New England put together, but Mr. McGee had overlooked the fact that the market of New England was at the doors of Nova Scotia, and that the market of western Canada was too far away to be of any service to Nova Scotia coal; and if the valuable life of Mr. McGee had been spared he would have lived to see Nova Scotia coal protected by a duty of at least 50 per cent. on the price of that coal at the pit's mouth, carried from the east to the west, carried on Government railways, not at trade rates, but at favored rates, in fact at a loss, and he would have seen that

NOT ONE LUMP OF COAL

from Nova Scotia ever reached Toronto. We have been told we have developed an inter-provincial trade between the east and the west. I deny it. I deny that we have succeeded in developing trade between the east and the west. We carry a small amount of

merchandise between the two sections, but is that the result of Confederation, is it the result of the Union? It is not. What trade we have between the east and the west is not a natural trade, but is due entirely to the fact that the country has to pay for the freight required to take it between the east and the west. You cannot legislate against nature, and nature has interposed obstacles in regard to the interchange of trade between the east and the west which no legislation can overcome; and, as year has followed year, it became more and more evident that the anticipations formed by the men of 1865 were mere delusions, that there could never be any profitable trade between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the one side, and the provinces beyond Quebec on the other. Then it was, seeing that our efforts had been baffled, seeing that the channels were not opened for trade which we had expected, that for the first time protection became a practical issue in this country. The advocates of the new idea fondly hoped and, indeed, resolutely asserted that the promulgation of a high tariff would stimulate the creation of so many manufactories, that it would bring in a large amount of immigration and would stop our emigration, that we would find the markets here that we had hoped to obtain elsewhere. And although during the agitation which took place in 1877 and 1878, all classes were promised that they would profit by the adoption of protection, the farmers were the class who were promised the greatest benefit. Indeed, the National Policy then was made to do duty all round, like

THE CELEBRATED MAGIC BOTTLE

in the hands of the juggler, which supplied wine or beer or spirits or water, just as the man to be served was a wine or beer man, a whiskey man, or a cold water man. So the farmers were told that, if we had protection, they would find a market for their products

at their doors. The leader of the Opposition at that time, in the speech which he made at Parkdale in July, 1878, said :—

By having all kinds of industries we would have a great country; the industries would be twice blessed, our sons would be prevented from going to a foreign country to add to its wealth and strength and skill. The fruits of their labor would be exchanged for the fruits of the soil, cities would multiply, and not only would there be a demand for the larger products, such as wheat, flour, cattle, and everything we could raise, but for cheese, butter, eggs, roots and other kinds of small produce. Why was it that land around villages was more valuable than land away from the villages, land about towns more valuable than land in villages, and land about cities more valuable than land in towns? Land about Toronto was not so good, from an agricultural point of view, as it was 30 or 40 miles away from the city, and yet it was more valuable. The reason was because the farmers living near Toronto could get a market for everything they could raise. They were not obliged to send it away to a distance. The nearer the farmer was to the market the cheaper it was for him to send in his goods, and that single illustration would suffice to show how dependent the workmen, manufacturer and farmer were upon each other.

In so far as this language tended to prove that the adoption of protection would develop a large manufacturing industry it was a fallacy, but, in so far as the honorable gentlemen meant to say that a large laboring population is the best market for the agricultural classes, I agree with him. England to-day not only absorbs all her own agricultural products, but drains the agriculture of many other countries besides. New England is very much in the same position. It not only consumes its own agricultural productions, but it absorbs those of many other States, and it even

DRAWS LARGELY FROM CANADA,

although the Canadian farmer has to pay a toll on

the frontier. But the prediction of the honorable gentlemen did not come true. The country was not overrun with the manufacturing class. There was no great increase in immigration. Emigration was not stopped. Many dreams were dispelled, many dreams turned out to be mere deceptions, for it is a matter of fact that many of the principal advocates of protection who prophecied those great results were the victims of their own preaching. In their great anxiety for the success of this new idea, they had represented the country as being overrun by manufactures, with magnificent buildings and tall chimneys throwing towards the sky the smoke of modern industry. They had represented cities and towns growing out of the ground, and teeming with artisans who would consume everything the farmer could grow, but these expectations did not come out true, and here again there was a failure. What was the cause? Why was it that the great expectations which were entertained of the future of the National Policy, were not realized? Because the agitators of 1877-78 completely lost sight of the fact that

MODERN INDUSTRIES CANNOT THRIVE

in limited markets. Modern industry in order to thrive must operate in large markets. The principle of modern industry is this: to minimize to an infinitesimal figure the profit upon manufactured articles, and then to increase the aggregate production to an unlimited quantity; in fact the profit upon the single article is always decreased in proportion as the aggregate production is increased. Under such circumstances no one can manufacture to advantage unless he manufactures in large quantities, and he who can manufacture in the largest market is always the cheapest manufacturer, and at the same time the man who can reduce the cost of production by ever so small an amount, will always drive his competitors from the field, and will overcome all the barriers

opposed to him. That is the reason why the National Policy did not succeed, that is the reason why the manufacturers did not multiply. Why, Sir, our manufactures, burdened as they are by the tariff, burdened on their coal, burdened on their raw material, cannot extend abroad because they cannot meet the products of free trade countries. They are limited to their own market, and within our own market, with a population of less than 5,000,000, they cannot expand and therefore they cannot thrive. Take the single article of cotton. It was expected that under the favor of the tariff all the great water powers from Kingston to Montreal would be lined with cotton mills, that we would have legions of cotton spinners and cotton weavers. Yet to-day, Sir, we have only twenty-three cotton mills, with an aggregate of 597,-688 spindles. These figures may seem large at first blush, but they are in reality insignificant. In the year 1871, England alone had over 22,000 cotton mills and 34,000,000 spindles; and at this very moment, in the little town of Cardiff, Wales, one single company is erecting thirteen mills with a capacity of more than 650,000 spindles. Therefore our figures are perfectly insignificant; our twenty-three cotton mills and 600,000 spindles are

A MERE DROP IN THE OCEAN.

But, Sir, the manufacturers of cotton started out for an immense output; they found themselves very soon with an immense surplus which they could not dispose of, and under such circumstances, what did they do? They combined, they agreed to reduce the production, they reduced the working hours, they dismissed their employees, and reduced production simply to the requirements of the country; and, upon the capital which had been invested, they agreed to pocket the large profits which the tariff gave them over foreign competitors. Yet, as I understand, those profits upon the large capital invested are not large.

Although we have only twenty-three mills and 600,000 spindles, yet these are too much for the requirements of the country. Not one of these mills is working to its full capacity to-day; they are all working on half time, or at least, not on full time. What is true of cotton is also true of woollens and other industries of the country, so the conclusion is inevitable that the National Policy has not realized the expectations which were entertained at the time. The National Policy has not developed a great national industry, and has not created the home market for our agricultural products, as we were promised. But, Sir, the necessity of widening the area of our trade and commerce is so great that all these many years we have been looking around in this direction and in the other direction to find new outlets and new channels for our trade. In the debate on the Address during the present Session, the mover of the Address told us with pride that the Government had sent a commissioner to Australia in order to obtain the trade of that country; he told us that they had opened communication with the Argentine Republic in order to establish a trade with that country. What will come of these efforts? What has come of all similar efforts? What has come of our sending commissioners to Brazil, to the West Indies, and to Spain? Nothing, for the very obvious reason that, burdened as we are by our protective tariff,

WE CANNOT MEET FREE TRADE ENGLAND

in those markets: so that the conclusion is inevitable that all the efforts we have made so far to develop our trade and commerce, and to broaden their area, since 1867, have been a succession of failures. What, then, is to be done? Is the problem without solution? Is the situation without hope? Is there nothing to be done but to fold our arms and to wait, and to wait, and to wait until something unforeseen and unexpected turns up, that will, perhaps, do for us

what we have failed to do for ourselves? No, there is a course open to us, and it is to revert to the only means which, in the past, have not failed—it is to adopt the resolution of my honorable friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright), it is to open as wide as we can all the avenues of trade between us and the 60,000,00 of people to the south of us. And here again let us recall the language of Mr. Brown. He expected the greatest possible results from the accession of 1,000,000 souls to our market. Here are his words:

> But here, Sir, is a proposal which is to add not only nearly a million of souls to our population, but to add valuable territory to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing.

Sir, these expectations would have been realised if natural obstacles had not interposed. But what we expect to-day from the resolution of my honorable friend, is not only the access of 1,000,000 souls to our market, it is

THE ACCESSION OF 60,000,000

of the most wealthy people on the face of the globe, with not even a molehill to separate us. Yet the Government will not accede to our proposition. The Government have no objection to send commissioners to the antipodes, but they will not send commissioners to Washington. They have no objection to open communication with the Argentine Republic and its 5,000,000 of souls, but they will not open communication with the great nation to the south of us whose trade is a thousand-fold the trade of the Argentine republic. But they have their reasons for it. They do not act on mere caprice. They have their reasons; they have a standing offer upon the statute-book that they are ready to open our market, to a certain extent, to the United States if that country will open its market to us to the same extent. Beyond that they

will not go, they stand upon their dignity and they will not budge an inch. The offer which is made by the Government to the United States is an offer of a limited character, in natural products only. It is not what we ask for. It is not an offer of unlimited trade, such as is asked for by my honorable friend to my left. My honorable friend has proved, at least to the satisfaction of everyone who will take a calm view of the matter, that unlimited reciprocity is preferable to limited reciprocity. Now, if the Government had secured the limited reciprocity which they have offered to the American Government, we would have been glad to accept it, and the Government would have been entitled to the thanks of the country. But the Government have failed in their efforts. That standing offer has been on the Statute-book for nine years now and the Americans have not yet chosen to bite at the bait; but it is not a bait, that is an improper expression,

IT WAS A THREAT.

It was intended as a threat to the American Government to see what evil consequences might fall if they refused to open their doors to us. The bait or threat, whatever it is, however, has been ineffectual, and we must try something else. Now, limited reciprocity may be looked upon as an impossible thing. I have not heard one single voice raised on the other side of the line in favor of limited reciprocity, while eminent statesmen, members of Congress, influential merchants, boards of trade, have again and again pronounced emphatically in favor of unlimited reciprocity, and to-day there are before Congress two measures in that direction. This sentiment, which is evinced by the propositions before Congress, is not of yesterday. It dates as far back as 1861. In that year the Board of Trade in the city of New York petitioned Congress in favor of an enlargement of the Reciprocity Treaty which existed at that time. That petition to Congress

was acted upon. In 1864, Congress considered a resolution from the Committee on Commerce in favor of an extension of the treaty and a widening of its provisions. That resolution was passed in March, 1864; it was laid over till December of that year, but nothing came of it, I am sorry to say. And why? Because of the events which took place in the year 1864, because of the unfriendly attitude maintained by England and by Canada towards the United States in the great struggle in which they were engaged at that time. The Alabama cruiser, fitted out in the port of Liverpool, the St. Albans' raid, prepared in Montreal, so far

EMBITTERED AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION

that it would not allow that resolution to be carried any further; but of the sentiments which were entertained at that time by the Administration of Mr. Lincoln we can obtain an idea by a letter which was written by Mr. Adams, who was at that time Minister to the Court of St. James', and which was addressed to Lord John Russell. It was dated November, 1864, and it said this:

> The welfare and prosperity of the neighboring British Provinces are as sincerely desired on our part as they can be by Great Britain. In a practical sense they are sources of wealth and influence for the one country only in a less degree than for the other, though the jurisdiction appertain only to the latter. That this is the sincere conviction of my Government has been proved by its consent to enter into relations of reciprocal free trade commerce with them almost as intimate as those which prevail between the several States of the Union themselves. Thus far the disposition has been to remain content with those relations under any and all circumstances, and that disposition will doubtless continue, provided always that the amity be reciprocated, and that the peace and harmony on the border, indispensable to its existence, be firmly secured.

Those were the sentiments of the Administration

of Mr. Lincoln in 1864, and they are the sentiments of the Administration of President Cleveland in 1888. Of the sentiments of the Administration of Mr. Cleveland upon this matter we have ample evidence in the correspondence exchanged between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper. In the letter addressed by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles (although that letter has often been quoted, I quote it again because it seems to me pregrant with meaning), Mr. Bayard, after having alluded to the necessity of settling the disputes arising out of the fisheries question, proposed a settlement in this manner:

> I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one wry to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations.

These words are pregnant with meaning, but their precise meaning is fully made out by what follows. Mr. Bayard continues:—

> The gravity of the present condition of affairs between our two countries demands entire frankness. I feel we stand at "the parting of the ways." In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility.

What is the meaning of this language: staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility? What was it in the mind of Mr. Bayard? The only way to settle this question was to remove those causes which threatened "a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with hues of hostility." I am glad to find that the gentleman to whom the letter was addressed, and who, unfortunately, is not in his seat to-day (Sir Charles Tupper), fully reciprocated those sentiments, and he said in his answer to Mr. Bayard:—

> I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but

one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries.

Those were the sentiments of two of the gentlemen who were afterwards engaged as plenipotentiaries, each for his own respective Government. The American plenipotentiaries made propositions to the British plenipotentiaries. What were those propositions? We have not yet been able to find out, for reasons which have not yet been explained, the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries, and those proposals have been

KEPT FROM THE PUBLIC.

But what can they have been? We can imagine what they were; and what else could they have been except a reflection of the sentiment expressed by Mr. Bayard himself, the Secretary of State, when writing to Sir Charles Tupper? What else could they have been but proposals to settle the question upon a basis which would remove from our long frontier the danger of "staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility?" What could they be but proposals for the abolition of customs between the two countries? I fail to find they could be anything else, and unless we are shown at a future day that I am in the wrong, and that they were not such proposals, I think we can fairly infer that such were the proposals emanating from Mr. Bayard. Did the British plenipotentiaries answer in that spirit? No. The proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries, and which we have before us, are not in the same spirit which dictated the answer of Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Bayard. Sir Charles Tupper in that answer said that he hoped also that the question would be settled by a "straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries." What was the new proposition by the Bri-

tish plenipotentiaries? Was it for an entire settlement of the question upon that line? No; the proposal was

SIMPLY AN ARRANGEMENT

for greater freedom of commercial intercourse. Sir Charles Tupper's proposal to settle the question was by an entire discussion of the trade relations, but the proposition of the British plenipotentiaries was simply for greater freedom of commercial intercourse than now exists. I say the hands of the British plenipotentiaries were handicapped by some power, either by the British Government or the Canadian Government; but it is manifest that the intentions of Mr. Bayard were not reciprocated by the British plenipotentiaries at the discussion of the treaty. So that, Mr. Speaker, the time is eminently well chosen now to move in the sense indicated by my honorable friend on my left, and send a commissioner to the Government at Washington to confirm the principle, if he sees it is possible to confirm it, which would remove hostility from our frontier line. But the Government will not have that. Even if it were offered, as I believe it was offered in the negotiation of the treaty, they will not have it. They will not have unrestricted reciprocity. They maintain their line of restricted reciprocity; they maintain the offer they have put upon the statute-book, of giving reciprocity in natural products only. What is the reason that they give for this? The reason they give is that, at present, unrestricted reciprocity would be fatal to our manufactories. Well, Sir, as to the argument, "unrestricted reciprocity would be fatal to our manufactories," it is admitted that unrestricted reciprocity would include reciprocity in natural products, and gentlemen on the other side are ready to give reciprocity in natural products. They admit thereby that reciprocity in natural products would be favorable and would benefit the growers of natural products, or, in other words,

that it would benefit the farmers. They say that the interests of farmers in this instance and the interests of manufacturers are antagonistic. They admit that unrestricted reciprocity, which includes reciprocity in natural products, would favor the farmers, but they say at the same time that it would injure the manufacturers. I do not admit the argument whatever, for I think reciprocity would be

USEFUL ALL ROUND.

But if it comes to this: that we are forced to choose between the growers of natural products and the manufacturers, for my part my choice is made. I stand by the industry which numbers 70 per cent. of our population. I stand by the industry without which no other industry can live. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not admit the argument at all. I do not for a moment admit that reciprocity in manufactured goods would be unfavorable to the manufacturers. What is the objection? The objection is that our infant industries, as they are termed, are not yet strong enough to compete with the industries of the American people. Sir, it is a particularity of these infants called industries, that they never grow. They are monsters, *lusus naturæ*, their appetite is insatiable, and yet they never get strong. They have to be kept on the feeding bottle all the time. You have to carry them in your arms all the time, and if you put them on their legs they moan most piteously and are too weak to stand. The poor things are in fact so very weak that they combine amongst themselves to extort from the country, not only what the country will give them willingly, but even what the country will not give them. I can well understand that the monopolist will not have unrestricted reciprocity. He has the market to himself; the market is not large, it is true, but he has it all to himself without competition, and furthermore if there were competition he would have to exert his brains and muscles as everybody else is compelled to do. But

THE GENUINE MANUFACTURER

not only is not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity, but will hail with joy the day that the American market is open to him. What is it that modern industry wants in order to thrive? It wants space, and nothing else but space; and give to our manufacturers that broad market of 60,000,000 of people and every one with a heart in his bosom and a head on his shoulders will tell you that he is ready and eager to compete with the American manufacturer. My honorable friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) stated the other day that he was opposed to the present movement, because he thought unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our manufactures, and he spoke from a local point of view. I am sorry that on this occasion I have to sever from him on this question. He said as follows:

> We know in the cities of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal the number of consumers of agricultural produce is largely increasing and our farmer goes to this market. Every week dealers go through our district buying eggs, poultry, animals, fruits and other articles of farm produce, and where do those articles go in much larger quantities than in the past? They go to the markets of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, where there are a larger number of consumers than in the past. Destroy by unrestricted reciprocity the manufacturing industry of those two cities, throw out of employment the thousands of workingmen who gain their living in those manufactories, and what would be the result? Our markets for the agriculturists' produce would lose its importance.

Sir, I will say to my honorable friend that the opinion which he expresses on the result of unrestricted reciprocity, with regard to the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe, is not the opinion of the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe. My honorable friend the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) is a manufacturer and he is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity; and I hold in my hand here a telegram from Mr. Boaz, who

is a large and well-known manufacturer of St. Hyacinthe, and who says if you give him the American market to-morrow, the day after to-morrow he will treble his establishment. This, Sir, is the opinion of a genuine manufacturer. It stands to common sense, and it stands to reason, that the larger the field is at the present day for the manufacturer, the larger will be his exertions and the larger his profit and his trade. But, Sir, there is another objection, and a most serious objection upon the face of it. We are told that unrestricted reciprocity

WOULD LARGELY AFFECT OUR REVENUE.

Under present circumstances the importations from the United States yield to our revenue an annual amount of $7,000,000. There is no doubt whatever that if unrestricted reciprocity were adopted we would lose that revenue. Sir, I say at once, and I say emphatically, that the prospect has no cause of alarm to me. The prospect would be a serious cause of alarm, Sir, if the revenue of the country had been kept to the legitimate expenditure of the country, if the revenue of the country had been kept to the figure indispensable to carry on the legislative business of the country, then, Sir, the necessity of providing the deficiency of such a large amount to be levied every year upon the people of the country would be a serious problem. But, Sir under the present high rate of taxation the revenue has been swelled far in excess of the legitimate requirements of the country. The equilibrium has been re-established by the Government between revenue and expenditure. But, how? By decreasing the revenue? No, but by illegitimately increasing the expenditure. Sir, this fact that we are illegitimately increasing the expenditure of the country beyond the natural requirements of the people is a serious matter which should grow on the consideration of the gentlemen of this House. It is fruitful of evil consequences. The United States to-

day suffer from the same state of things. They have also

AN ABNORMALLY LARGE REVENUE,

and although the expenditure has been kept down to a legitimate expenditure, still all the evils that we have to-day, from a large revenue and a large expenditure, have also arisen in the United States. In a recent number of *Harper's Weekly* the editor of that most valuable, able and high-toned paper, after having reviewed the policy of President Jefferson—who favored a large expenditure, and in order to have a large expenditure would maintain a tariff providing for a surplus—goes on to speak in this way, and his language I commend to everyone who thinks of those matters in this House:

> Experience, however, has proved what Jefferson could not foresee that the course he favored leads to overtaxation, class legislation, a general derangement of commerce and industry, and political corruption.

All of these evils we have in this country. We have had class legislation, we have had over-taxation, and we have political corruption—political corruption so bold that it does not even seek at this day to hide its shame. Let me in this connection quote the words spoken only a few weeks ago by the Premier of this country in the city of Quebec. At the dinner given there to the Minister of Militia, he uttered these pregnant words:

> Sandfield Macdonald, a Scotchman, and like all Scotchmen but myself, exceedingly economical, took great pains to save up a surplus. The Opposition abused him, and said he had not the heart to spend the money, but that when they got into power they would divide it. So that he was literally bought out with his own money. No Grit successor of the present Government will find much surplus left after us to spend among his supporters. Our opponents say that we

bribe the constituencies, but we bribe them with their own money.

Sir, this is the level to which the politics of this country has been lowered by the false system which we have been pursuing for so may years. Sir, I will hail with joy the day when it will no longer be in the power of this Government or any other Government

TO BRIBE THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY

with their own money. I will hail with joy the day when no more money will be extorted from the people of this country than is absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the country; and if unrestricted reciprocity were to do nothing else than to reduce the expenditure to such a normal figure that it would be impossible for any Government to distribute money among the constituencies to bribe them, with my both hands I would vote for unrestricted reciprocity. The advantages, Mr. Speaker, of a free, untrammelled commercial intercourse between this country and the great country to the south of us cannot be denied. Indeed, they are not denied. No assertion has been made on the other side of the House against the assertion made on this side that great benefits would follow such an interchange. The objections made are not made to the idea itself, but all the objections are based simply on the supposition that this course would be fatal to some interests in our own county. But, Sir, the one great objection which we have heard from all quarters on the other side of the House has been the cry of disloyalty. That cry came as a lugubrious knell in all the speeches we have heard on this question. The objection was taken that to admit the importations from the United States free of duty, while we tax the importations from Great Britain, would be disloyal. The objections made on the subject were crystallised in

one sentence by the honorable Minister of the Interior, in reply to an interruption by my honorable friend from Prince Edward Island:

What I said was that a differential duty against England was disloyal to the mother-country and inconsistent with our position.

Sir, if this objection means anything it simply means that, if we find it is to be to our advantage to adopt reciprocal free trade with the United States, we should forego that advantage, because we are a colony of England. That is the proposition made by gentlemen on the other side. I denounce such a proposition; I repudiate it; I denounce it as unmanly, as anti-Canadian,

AND EVEN ANTI-BRITISH.

To pretend, Sir, that our colonial allegiance demands from us that we should be deterred from the spirit of enterprise, that we should refuse to extend our trade and to increase our prosperity according to the best methods which commend themselves to our judgment, to pretend that this is loyalty, I deny; and if I were to characterize the sentiment in the only language in which it ought to be characterized, I would say this is not loyalty, but that it is mere flunkeyism. We are a colony of England, it is true; but we are a colony not by force, but by choice; and if we are a colony to-day, it is because we are convinced that at the present day our colonial dependence is quite compatible with the largest measure of national advancement and material prosperity. If you, on the other side, pretend that our colonial relation curtails and limits our possibilities, that England would allow us to reach a certain altitude and go no higher, I say you slander England; and if any man were to rise on the other side and tell us that England would be jealous at whatever we could do to improve our condition, I would say that man does not know England, he mis-

takes the England of to-day for the England of 100 years ago. I commend to the consideration of these fervent loyalists on the other side, whose mouths are ever full of the word loyalty, the following words spoken by Lord Palmerston, 20 years ago, in reference to the British North American provinces:—

> If these provinces felt themselves strong enough to stand upon their own ground, and if they desire no longer to maintain their connection with us, we should say: "God speed you and give you the means to maintain yourselves as a nation!"

There are

THE SENTIMENTS OF BRITISH STATESMEN.

They tell us that, whenever we want our political liberty, we are free to have it. But what we ask, Sir, is not political independence—we want to keep the flag of England over our heads; but we affirm that we are economically independent as we are legislatively independent. Sir, colonies have interests in common with the mother land, but colonies have interests of their own also. To-day we levy a heavy toll on all imports from Great Britain. We do that not only for the sake of collecting revenue, but also for the purpose of protection, to enable us to manufacture ourselves what we had formerly purchased from England, and to that extent to destroy British trade. There was a time when this would not have been tolerated; there was a time when England would have disallowed such a policy; but now we adopt it as a matter of course; now our policy is never questioned—why? Because England has long ago admitted the principle that colonies have interests of their own, and that it is within their right and power to develop and foster and promote those interests, even to the point of clashing with British interests. It was not always so, however. In the last century England lost her American colonies

BECAUSE THAT PRINCIPLE WAS IGNORED.

The American revolution broke out in vindication of the principle that taxation and representation should go together. Principles may lie dormant for generations until called forth for the solution of some great issue. And what was the issue which called for the vindication of those principles by the American colonies? The issue was this: At that time there was a trade in the American colonies, and there was also a British trade; and the British Parliament, from which the colonies were excluded, legislated exclusively for British trade against the interests of American trade. In our own country, in the year 1837, a rebellion broke out in the two largest colonies left to England, and in both the provinces the cause of the rebellion was the same. It was that the British Government persistently ignored the interests of the colonies as represented by their Legislatures. The British Government, at that time, did not hold upon those matters the same opinion that it holds to-day; but when rebellion broke out, not only in Lower Canada, where the population was not of British origin, but even in Upper Canada, the British Government sent a commissioner to investigate the cause of the rebellion. In their selection of Lord Durham they were most lucky, for in him they chose a man of great sagacity of mind, great personal courage, and large and liberal views. If it were my duty to review his report, I would be bound to take exception to the conception which he formed of my own countrymen; but as to the main conception of the report, as to the main idea which governed it, it was one of the greatest conceptions of an age fertile in great conceptions. It was,

INDEED, A REVOLUTION.

Lord Durham found at once that the colonies had interests of their own, and that these interests had to be prosecuted to their logical end; and he came to

the conclusion that local parliaments were the only parliaments fitted to deal with them. He suggested therefore to give the colonies responsible government. That was indeed a revolution. Every country which, up to that time, had colonies, always thought it was necessary to keep its colonies close in hand; they all believed that to grant the slightest emancipation would generate a desire for complete emancipation. Lord Durham found that the converse proposition was true. He found and maintained that coercion generated the desire for emancipation, but that freedom would be a bond of union. That was a revolution, indeed; it was one of the greatest conceptions of the age, and all the greater because of the circumstances under which it was formed. There was a rebellion at the time in which two provinces participated. There was a rebellion in the Upper Province of Canada, where the population was of British origin; there was a rebellion, a far more dangerous one, in Lower Canada, where the population was of alien origin, and had only recently been made subjects of England. And at that very moment, when the country was in the throes of civil war, when the soil was reeking with bloodshed, when British domination had to be maintained by force of arms, at that moment Lord Durham said:

MAKE THEM FREE,

and you will make them loyal. And we who live to-day are the happy witnesses of the sagacity of his mind and the realization of his prophecy. We who live to-day have seen how his policy has planted deep-felt loyalty where fifty years ago rebellion existed. But, Sir, I ask honorable gentlemen opposite what is the extent of the freedom which was then granted to us? I say it extends as far as Canadian interests extend, and to that extent we, on this side, claim it. At that time, it is true, Lord Durham had not one disciple. British statesmen could not conceive that

responsible government could exist in a colony as it existed at home, and it was not until another master mind, Lord Elgin, came to this country, that the policy of Lord Durham received its full measure of adoption. But Lord Elgin went further. He negotiated the treaty of reciprocity, and in that treaty he admitted the principle of discrimination against British trade. Is there an honorable gentleman on the other side of the House who will pretend that these great men, Lord Durham and Lord Elgin, did not save the British Crown on this continent? Will any one pretend that the colonies would have long consented to be governed by the Colonial Office, through the instrumentality of a petty family compact? Who is not aware that the reciprocity treaty, negotiated by Lord Elgin in 1854, effectually quelled the agitation for annexation which followed 1849. I say to our honorable friends opposite: You want to maintain British connection on this continent, and so say I; but I add this, that if you want to maintain British connection on this continent, British connection must walk abreast with all the requirements of this country. In this connection, I cannot do better than quote the minute of council of the Coalition Government of 1865, which is pregnant with meaning, in view of the present circumstances. The minute is as follows:

> Under the beneficient operation of the system of self-government, which the later policy of the mother-country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitations for organic changes has ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has wholly disappeared.

Here is the admission that reciprocity with the

United States effectually quashed the agitation for annexation which followed 1849:—

> Although the colonies would grossly misrepresent their countrymen if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal, through the unfriendly action of a foreign Government, of mere commercial privileges, however valuable these might be deemed, they think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity and the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people.

There is no fear of any desire for organic changes as long as the people are prosperous. But the moment the people will begin to believe that their prosperity would be increased by an organic change, from that moment danger may arise. As to our moral right to act as we have acted in this matter, I have not the slightest doubt. The objection of honorable gentlemen opposite would have been a much stronger one, at least in my eyes, if it had been made from a different standpoint. If instead of telling us that we have not the right to propose to discriminate against England, they had said it would not be generous to England to discriminate against her, the objection, to my mind, would have been far stronger; and if I am not trespassing beyond the limits of good taste in speaking of my own individual sentiments, I would say that this is a consideration which gave me much concern. We have been told in the course of this debate, in many instances, that sentiment should not be allowed in politics. That view I do not take. My opinion is that sentiment may, as well in politics as in everything else, well shape our actions to the extent of making us generous if we can be generous without

any sacrifice of duty. Sir, I am a subject of French origin, and I have often stated—and you, Mr. Speaker, agree with me—that there is

NO MORE LOYAL RACE OF MEN

under the British Crown on the American continent than Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. Loyalty is natural to you, men of British origin; it flows in your blood; you have inhaled it from the heart of your mothers; but I tell you that gratitude has worked in the hearts of my countrymen feelings of the same nature which is implanted in your hearts by your origin or your birth. With all my soul I say, let my tongue adhere to the roof of my mouth if it were ever to speak an unkind word of England; let my right hand wither if it participated in anything which would be unfair to England. But this is not a question of sentiment. This is a question of duty, and if you put it in the light, that I have to choose between the duty I owe to England, and the duty I owe to my native land, I stand by my native land. And there is not an Englishman, with an English heart in his bosom, that will not say the same if he is a true born Briton. Sir, England would treat us with contempt if we were to act otherwise than we are acting. England expects from us that we shall do the best we can for ourselves, and she will take care of herself, without any assistance from Canadian Tories. I am quite sure of one thing. It is quite possible that John Bull may grumble, but in his grumbling there will be as much pride as anger, and John Bull will feel flattered if there is an offspring of his so much like the old gentleman that he will not lose any occasion to earn an honest penny. John Bull will feel flattered if he finds that scion of his a true chip of the old block. But there is another kind of loyalty which has not been alluded to on the other side of the House, and which should be taken into consideration in this instance. I have not heard from the other side a word about the

loyalty which we owe to Confederation. Twenty years ago we united the British provinces on this continent with the view of making

A NEW NATIONALITY

and with the hope of making them a nation. It was then a union on paper. It was expected that it would be made a real union. The union has lasted twenty years, and what is the result to-day? What have we achieved during those twenty years? I say that to-day, after twenty years, the union which, in 1867, was a mere union on paper is to-day still a mere union on paper. The hearts of the people by the sea are not in the union.

Some honorable members:—They are.

Mr. Laurier:—My honorable friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was once rebuked for saying that he was a Nova Scotian by birth and a Canadian by act of Parliament. I say, and I think I speak with knowledge, that the sentiments which were then uttered by my honorable friend are the sentiments entertained by nineteen-twentieths of the people of Nova Scotia.

Some honorable members:—No.

Mr. Laurier: Yes. Perhaps it will be said that I have no cause to speak that way, because Nova Scotia has returned a majority to support the Government. Sir, the reason why Nova Scotia has returned a majority to support the Government is that the issue which the Liberal party placed before the people of Nova Scotia was not repeal. I believe in Confederation; we believe in Confederation, and we want the people of the Maritime provinces to understand that it is the policy of the Liberal party not so much to induce them to return to support us, but to win them over to Confederation, and to make them not only loyal British subjects, as they are, but loyal Canadians as well. If you want to do that, if you want to achieve that object, you must revise your policy altogether;

if you want to achieve that object, you must give to the people of Nova Scotia and the Maritime provinces their natural market.

LET THEM TRADE

where it is most profitable for them to trade, and their hearts will be won over to the Canadian flag, not only to the British flag. It was our hope at one time to make this country a nation. It is our hope yet.

Some honorable members:—Hear, hear!

Mr. Laurier:— I hail that sentiment with joy, with unbounded joy, all the more that it is altogether unforeseen. I had expected, from the talk we have heard from these gentlemen on the other side of the House, that they expected that this country would forever and forever remain a colony. I see now that they have higher aspirations, and I give them credit for that. Colonies are destined to become nations, as it is the destiny of a child to become a man. No one, even on the other side, will assume that this country, which will some day number a larger population than Great Britain, is forever to remain in its present political relation with Great Britain. The time is coming when the present relations of Great Britain and Canada must either become closer or be severed altogether. For my own part, I do not intend at present to carry out this line of thought any further, but I simply say that, if ever and whenever Canada chooses, to use the language of Lord Palmerston, to stand by herself, the separation will take place not only in peace, but in friendship and in love, as the son leaves the house of his father to become himself the father of a family. But this is not the question of to-day. To-day we have to face a problem of no small magnitude, which is to provide the best means of developing and broadening the area of our trade to such an extent as to afford to our stugling industries the space they require

TO THRIVE AND DEVELOP.

This is the duty of the present hour; this is the task which has to be faced and met. We, on this side of the House, believe that the motion of my honorable friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) exactly meets the case; we believe that the solution of the problem is complete in unrestricted reciprocity with the great nation to the south of us. I fully appreciate the objection of our friends on the other side, who say that our course is not generous towards England. My answer is simply this: I only wish that we could offer to England the same propositions that we offer to-day to the American people. England has opened to us her doors. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have closed our doors against England. They have done it, I know, not in any spirit of hostility towards England, but because they thought it was in the interest of this country. They have adopted protection as their deliberate policy. England has the policy of free trade. England is 3,000 miles away from us. The policy of the United States is a policy of protection, the same as ours. They are our nearest neighbors. There are our channels of trade. Therefore, the course we take is not a matter of choice, it is the dictate of reason. I fully appreciate as well the objection of those who say this is the first of a series of changes which must end in annexation. Sir, I grant at once that there is force in the objection if you look only at the surface; but it is the greatest posible misconception in politics to believe that the same mould will reproduce the same casts of events. It is true that history ever repeats itself, but

HISTORY NEVER REPEATS ITSELF

in identically the same terms. It is true that the same causes always produce the same effects, but those effects are always modified by a variety of con-

comitant circumstances. Who, for instance, would have expected, fifty years ago, that the concession of responsible government would have resulted, as it has resulted, in a closer union between England and Canada? All the wiseacres of that day predicted that the concession which was made at that time would result in the absolute severance of Canada from the Empire, but all the prophecies have been falsified. The result has been to draw the two countries closer together than ever. We anticipate on this side of the House that the carrying of my honorable friend's resolution will have the effect of bringing about such prosperity to this country that trade will increase, not only between Canada and the United States, but between Canada and Great Britain herself, and make the bonds of union still stronger than they are. Nor, Sir, would I treat lightly the misgivings of those who, on the threshold of a great event, as this is sure to be, stand irresolute, dreading the unknown. I can well conceive that sentiment. Even when the mind is satisfied that a given political situation has become intolerable, that a change has to be made, even then the contemplated reform may, perhaps, be looked upon with misapprehension. For instance, the most radical reformer amongst us, convinced though he may be that a revision of the Union Act which binds the three kingdoms together has become necessary, still may not look without anxiety to the impending change. When the past has been so glorious, when the present condition of things, though it has wrought intolerable evils, has made England so great, even he who is determined to amend the present constitution and amend it effectually to remove existing evils—even he, Sir, perhaps would not touch the existing fabric except with a trembling hand. But at the same time the staunchest Tory must admit that the history of England has been

AN UNCEASING TRANSFORMATION.

There has not been one century when England did

not change, when England has been the same as in the century before. England moved onward and onward, from progress to progress, until she has reached her present position. Yet every one of those changes, which have made England what she is to-day, has been met by Tories and by Conservatives with the taunts of disloyalty with which we are met to-day. To go no further back than the present century when Catholic Emancipation had become unavoidable, all the Tories of England, from the King downwards, wept over the fall of England. When the Reform Bill was carried, all the Tories of England wept over the downfall of their country; when the Corn Laws were abolished, still the Tories of England had more tears to shed. In our own country, when responsible government was first agitated, all the Tories of Canada wept over the impending rupture of British connection; and when, a few years afterwards, responsible government was carried into effect, the Tories no longer wept, but they raved, they burst out into a torrent of passion. Their rage was perfectly genuine, but the tears they shed were merely crocodile tears. What the Tories, British or Canadian, wept over upon those occasions, was not the downfall of England, was not the rupture of British connection, but it was the loss of some privilege or some monopoly which, upon all those occasions, was forcibly removed from their grasp. Sir, if the views of the Canadian Tories had prevailed fifty years ago, Canada would still be a medley of scattered provinces, each governed or rather owned

BY A SMALL FAMILY COMPACT.

If the Tories of to-day, if those whose lamentations we have heard for the last fifteen days, had lived fifty years ago, they, like their ancestors, would have howled with loyal yells against the reforms which have raised Canada from the position which she then held to the proud position which she occupies to-day;

they would have opposed those reforms with the same cries of loyalty with which they meet us to-day; and I venture to say, judging of the future by the past, that the Tories fifty years hence will rejoice at the adoption of the resolution of my honorable friend, as it must be adopted some day, though, true to their Tory nature, they will shrink from the reforms which will then be necessary. Sir, I am not disposed to treat otherwise than with respect those protests which have been raised against the disturbance of the present state of things. I am reminded, in this connection, of some words written by Armand Carrel, a Frenchman of great power and greater promise, who, unfortunately, fell a premature victim of that curse of French civilization, duelling. Armand Carrel had been an officer in the French army, and had deserted to join one of those numerous insurrections which took place in Spain about the year 1820, in favor of constitutional government. He was taken prisoner, court-martialled and sentenced to death; but after a series of dramatic incidents he obtained a new trial and was finally acquitted. Referring, some years later, to the events which had brought on those insurrections, the French revolution, the Napoleonic wars, and the organic disturbances created by those events, the new aspirations developed, in consequence, in some classes of society, and, in other classes of society, the intense attachment to the old *regime* and the intense desire for its restoration, he concluded as follows:

> Events in their continual and fatal transformation do not carry all minds with them, nor curb all characters with an equal facility, nor take care of all interests; this must be understood and something must be forgiven to the protestations which rise in favor of the past. When a period is ended, the mould is shattered, and it is enough for Providence that it cannot be reconstituted.

Those words seem to be full of meaning, and they seem forcibly to teach the lesson that it is the duty of Reformers ever to stand up to the duty of the hour,

WITHOUT FEAR OF THE CONSEQUENCES,

either to themselves or to the country; ever respecting, but still never heeding, those protests which are sure to be raised in favor of the past—in the words of President Lincoln "with malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." Sir, believing that I appeal to all Reformers on the present occasion, I appeal not only to those who belong to the Reform organization, but I appeal to all those who believe that the world cannot remain stationary; I appeal to all those who believe that new exigencies are always arising which require to be dealt with; I appeal to all those who believe that the present economical condition of Canada is false and dangerous; I appeal to the old men who, in former years, have borne the brunt of many battles in favor of reform, and who have lent a helping shoulder to bring up their country to the high level it occupies to-day; I appeal to the young men whose aim it is to raise their country still higher —of all I ask their support in the task we have undertaken at this time. Sir, our opponents on this occasion again drag up their old-time weapon of abuse. They tell us that we are disloyal, that we are traitors,

THAT WE ARE ANNEXATIONISTS.

With such invectives we are not concerned. Those invectives are only an anticipation of those with which we will be assailed by our opponents. Again, they will appeal to all the prejudices that may lie in the people against this policy. They will again torture noble sentiments in order to arouse suspicion against this policy, they will again probe the narrow corners of the heart in order to awaken what may be found there low and vile against this new policy. But with such tactics we are not concerned. Such tactics have been faced before and we must face them again. They say that without a doubt the people

will repel us, that victory will again perch on the banners of the Conservative party. With such considerations we are not concerned. Our considerations are higher, our aims are higher than such low, vulgar, vile, selfish considerations, And, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to all those who believe that politics are neither a trade, nor a gain; I appeal to all those who believe that politics are a duty which must be discharged, not with a view to the gain to be attained, but discharged simply for duty's sake, and to those, in the language of the poet, I say

> Onward! throw all terrors off!
> Slight the scorns, scorn the scoff.
> In the race, and not the prize,
> Glory's true distinction lies.
> Triumph herds with meanest things,
> Common robbers, vilest slings,
> 'Mid the reckless multitude!
> But the generous, but the good
> Stand in modesty alone,
> Still serenely struggling on,
> Planting peacefully the seeds
> Of brighter hopes and better deeds.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that my honorable friend to my left has planted the seeds of brighter hopes and better days for this country when he moved this resolution. We may be defeated; but as my honorable from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said a few days ago, time is with us. Yes,

TIME IS WITH US,

the cause is true and it will prevail. We are just now in the last days of a long and severe winter. Nature, which is now torpid and inert, will awaken in a few days under the penetrating influences of a warmer sun, and the great river at the foot of the cliff on which we stand, now imprisoned in the close embrace of frost, will throw off her shackles and roll unfettered

and free toward the sea.So sure as this will happen, I say that under the penetrating influence of discussion, of better feelings on both sides of the line, the hostility which now stains our long frontier will disappear, the barriers which now obstruct trade will be burst open and trade will pour in along all the avenues from the north, free, untrammelled and without fear of embarrassment or provocation.

Death of Hon. Thomas White

(*HOUSE OF COMMONS*)

SITTING OF 23RD APRIL, 1888

Of all the brief addresses ever delivered in the House of Commons on the occasion of the death of a member, the following is, perhaps, the one which produced the greatest effect, and it is consequently regarded in Parliament as a model of its kind:

MR. SPEAKER,

In seconding the motion, I can scarcely find words to give expression to the very sad emotions which this occasion arouses. Engaged as we are in daily strife, divided as we are in aims and purposes, struggling for our own convictions, we are too apt to forget what we readily realize to-day, that after all there is an universal kin amongst us; and when a man Mr. White's eminence is removed from amongst us we all individually feel that we have suffered a loss, and perhaps, for the first time, we can see the full measure of the man's worth. It is, however, a misfortune of our nature that we never appreciate fully what we have until we have lost it, and this feeling comes forcibly to me to-day. In Mr. White's death the whole nation has suffered a great loss, but I realize and understand that to his friends the blow must seem almost unbearable. His untiring energy and industry, his vast and wide knowledge of all political questions, his aptitude for business, his great admin-

istrative ability, his skill in debate, his eloquence, all were the happy combination of varied qualities which made him a tower of strength to those with whom he was associated, and we on this side of the House can never forget, as has been said by the Minister of Public Works, that upon all occasions, whether on the floor of Parliament or whether in his department as an executive officer of the Crown, he was always civil, courteous and obliging. But I am sure that, great as the blow must be to the country at large, to his party and to his family, there is no one who feels it more deeply than the veteran Premier. We all can sympathize with him, and we do sympathize with him, and much as we may differ from him in politics on various questions, we all understand that at his time of life the death of a long trusted friend must deal a severe blow. Death with us has been of late unusually cruel; Mr. White is the ninth of our colleagues we have lost since last elections. Death has been unsparing, striking alike on all ages and stations, and this last blow, coming as it does so suddenly and so unexpectedly after so many others, recalls very forcibly the words of Burke: "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue !"

Mr. Laurier before the people of Ontario

THE LIBERAL GATHERING AT OAKVILLE

GREAT OVATION IN HONOR OF THE LIBERAL LEADER

HIS OPINION ON THE ECONOMIC SITUATION OF THE COUNTRY

Especially since his elevation to the leadership of the Liberal party, Mr. Laurier has made it an annual practice to address the people of Ontario on the great questions of the day. His tour of 1888 was a series of triumphal receptions. The Young Liberals of Toronto set the example by inviting him to speak on the 13th August at Oakville, in the county of Halton, which was then in the throes of an election The festivity was splendid and the following speech was reported in full by the whole Liberal press of the province :

I would vainly endeavor to find words to convey to you the full measure of the gratitude that I feel I owe you for the kind recognition you are pleased to give me on this occasion. I can assure you from the bottom of my heart that my words are not mere empty words or the mere perfunctory expressions of conventional formality. I deeply feel what I now say, and,if I were allowed without any impropriety to add one word more in reference to myself, I would say that nothing whatever in the course of my life has

ever cheered me more than the reception which has been given me by my fellow-citizens of Ontario, in the position which the too partial regard of my friends of the House of Commons has placed upon me. To you, Sir, I feel especially grateful for the kind words you have spoken of me. I am a French-Canadian, as I need not repeat to you. You have heard it before, and I need not tell it you again. But while my heart ever feels warm towards the land of my ancestors,

MY FIRST ALLEGIANCE

is to England, nay, to Canada. I need not tell you that the Liberal party has suffered greatly from the loss of Mr. Blake. He was a personality in himself. He is one of those allies whose loss nothing can make up for. If the party has not suffered more than it has since his withdrawal from the leadership, it is due, in the first place, to the example he has left to us, to the strength he has given to the party, and due also largely, too, to the able men who surround me in the House of Commons, and, above all, to my friend, Sir Richard Cartwright, who during last session produced a policy which, dashed as it may be upon the billows of infuriated faction, assailed as it may be by passionate prejudice, tortured as it may be by greed and avarice, is bound to win, and I hope will win in this county of Halton not later than next week. We have come here to-day in reference to an issue which is before us at this moment, and I have come here to talk to you of it. For myself, though I am at this moment the responsible head of the Reform party, I claim for myself no other merit than that of belonging to the great body of Canadian Reformers. And by "Reformers" I do not mean alone those who are to be found in the ranks of the Reform party, but all those who believe that the world cannot forever remain stationary. That is to be left behind in the race. Unless the principles which guide a community include that of reformation in order to suit the require-

ments of the community, it cannot remain for long progressive. These are the principles that actuate us. I see before me a large number of men who evidently have been veterans in former Reform struggles, and nothing can give me more pleasure than to see near me on the platform my old friend, Joe Rymal, whose name is a household word in every house in Ontario, and who has been one of those veterans of Reform who have stood the brunt of many conflicts in former times. Sir, Mr. Rymal and others of his generation can testify that there never was a Canadian generation which had not to fight that battle in the cause of Reform, which had not to battle

AGAINST SOME NATIONAL EVIL.

In their earlier years this country—not only Upper Canada, but Lower Canada, my native province—was held as a close corporation by a few favored individuals who toiled not, neither did they spin, but who yet lived upon the fat of the land. They can remember that it took Robert Baldwin almost a whole lifetime to grapple with this evil and overcome it, and at last to obtain a government by the people and for the people. They can remember that after this evil disappeared another came to the front. The union between Lower Canada and Upper Canada had been so clumsily drawn that so fair and honest a principle as representation by population was systematically denied by one province, then by another, because it was feared that representation by population would prove an instrument of tyranny in the hand of the powerful province. They can remember that it took George Brown also a whole lifetime to obtain justice not only for the province of Ontario, but for the whole united province of Canada. It took him a whole lifetime to obtain the remedy of that evil and to substitute for the clumsy Legislative union the present Federal union of the British American provinces. Well, Sir, I will say to the Reformers of this county of

Halton, to the Reformers of the province of Ontario, that we also, we Reformers of the year 1888, we Canadians of this day, have a task to perform, a duty to achieve and an evil to grapple with, which, if not grappled with,

MUST DRAG DOWN THIS OUR COUNTRY.

Sir, I put it to any of you. It is now twenty-one years since Confederation was established. We started with the hope—is it not true?—we started with the hope as it was said at that time, that we would link together the British provinces on the continent of America, that we would bind them together with ties of affection and mutual pride and that we would make them a nation. Such was our dream, such was our hope often expressed, often repeated. Now, I ask every one in this audience, no matter what may have been in the past his predilections, no matter whether he has been a Conservative or a Reformer—I ask every one in this audience, looking back over the time, how far have we advanced in the task we set ourselves to perform twenty-one years ago? Sir, the painful answer must be that we have not advanced one iota, one single jot. And what is the reason? The reason cannot be other than this, that Canada has not found under the new regime the prosperity which was the goal we had set out to obtain. I would not compare our lot with the lot of European populations, but I ask you if it is not true that we have not reached the prosperity which was the goal to which we were looking? It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Ministerial press will not admit that; I do not expect from them any admission, but I would ask the opinion upon that subject of any Conservative who may do me the honor of listening to me. The Conservative press assert that we are a most prosperous people, but they reason after the manner of Sir John Falstaff; they take sentiments for facts. Sir John Falstaff had bragged that the Prince owed him a thousand pounds,

and when taken to task by the Prince, who said, "Sirrah, do I owe you a thousand pounds?" he replied, "Dost thou owe me a thousand pounds, Hal? Thou owest me thy life and thy love, and thy life and thy love are worth a million." That is the way the Conservative press argue. When we say we are not prosperous, they say, "We belong to the greatest Empire in the world." And so we do, but, at the same time, we have not under the Empire

THAT SHARE OF PROSPERITY

that is due to us, which should be our lot as Canadians, as part and parcel of this great continent. But, sir, there is a criterion which we can always resort to in order to ascertain whether the population is as prosperous as it ought to be. Real estate, in our state of civilization, is a pretty fair criterion of the prosperity of the people. If the value of real estate is going up, that is a fair evidence of prosperity; if real estate is going down, it seems to me there must be something wrong somewhere. I venture to assert this much, and I assert it without fear of successful contradiction, that in the Dominion of Canada, apart from the large railway centres, real estate for the last eight years has not been advancing; in a great many places it has been retrograding. I do not know how it is in the county of Halton, but I say this for the province from which I come, that there is not in Quebec a single farm which would sell for the price it would have sold for eight years ago. I invite reflection upon this point by whatever Conservatives there may be in this audience. And the reason is obvious, the reason is not far to seek. What is it that makes real estate valuable in our railway centres? It is because population is bound to resort to those centres in our state of civilization. What is it that makes real estate valuable anywhere? Population. Show me

A THICKLY-SETTLED COUNTRY

and I will show you a country where real estate is valuable. What is the fact about our population? The fact is that there is going on a serious loss of our population. Hundreds, and we might almost say thousands, of our fellow-countrymen are daily leaving our country to give their labor to the other side of the line. I know that is a statement which will be denied by the Conservative press, but I appeal to the intelligence of this audience. If the Conservative press deny this, why do they not deny that the sun shines, that fire burns, that water runs down hill, that night succeeds the day and day the night, that two and two make four? They might as well deny any of these propositions as to deny that we are losing our own population. Sir, what I now say I will not advance any statistics to prove, but I appeal to the intelligence of every man in this audience, to the experience of every man in this audience. And, sir, I may say this in Ontario, as I have often stated it in my own province: there is not a man, not one single man of the race to which I belong, in the province of Quebec, of forty or forty-five years of age, who has not on the other side of the line a near relative—a father, a son, an uncle or a cousin. That is a pretty broad statement to make, still I make it as regards my own province without fear of successful contradiction. I reassert that there is not one single French Canadian in Quebec to-day of the age of forty-five years who has not in the United States some of his own relatives. And if I were to ask any one of this audience—you, sir, or you, or you—to tell me if you have some relative in the United States, I believe the answer would be, I have—a son, a cousin, an uncle, as the case may be. Is not that state of things most appalling? Why is it that we should have emigration from our country? I can understand emigration from Europe to America, but I cannot understand emigration from Canada to the United States.

I can understand emigration from Ireland, ill-governed as it has been for centuries. I can understand emigration from Great Britain where the struggle for food is ever recurring—a subject of anxiety with millions of our fellow-men. I can understand emigration from Germany crushed as it is under a military despotism. But I ask in Canada

WHAT CAN BE THE CAUSE,

what can be the reason for emigration? Can it be that our institutions are not equal to the American institutions? There is not a man here in Canada who would say that. We say not merely that our institutions are equal to those of our neighbors, but that they are better, more elastic and more conducive to freedom. Can it be, Sir, that our soil and climate are inferior to the soil and climate of the United States? Sir, I say this: I am willing to grant, for it is so, that the Americans have the advantage of a greater variety of climate, but in everything that makes a great race, in everything that makes a noble and manly race, we have the advantage of climate and production over our American neighbors. Well, then, if the fault is not to be found in the soil or the climate, or in the institutions of the land, where can the fault be, for it must be somewhere? I invite every one in this audience, whatever may have been his political convictions before, to give me an answer if he can. The answer I give is this, and it seems to me to be manifest that there can be no answer but this: If the fault is not to be found in the institutions, or the soil, or the climate, then the evil must be in the economic policy of the Government.

A Voice—That's the root of the matter.

Honorable Mr. Laurier—That is

THE ROOT OF THE EVIL INDEED.

I will not be so dishonest as to say that the economic policy of the Government, the national policy, is the

sole and whole cause of the evil from which we suffer. Sir, I am a Liberal and a Reformer, and I claim to speak always honestly to my fellow-countrymen, to tell the truth, even when it may not be wholly palatable. I claim this merit—that I speak my own convictions. I do not lay the whole blame upon the national policy, but I charge this upon the Government of the land—I arraign them for this—that they promised, ten years ago, to remove the evil and they have not removed it; but, on the contrary, their policy has intensified it. Ten years ago, Mr. Chairman, you were quite a young man, but, coming from such a good stock as you do, I am sure you took an active part in politics even then. You remember what took place in those days. It was in the last days of the administration of Mr. Mackenzie. You remember that, everywhere where there was a stump large enough to hold two feet, there you found a Conservative orator preaching that Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues were flies on the wheel and good for nothing; that if they had a little of the brains of the other side they would have devised a plan which would have cured the country of the evil from which it was suffering. We were suffering from a severe depression in trade. Mr. Mackenzie told you, Sir Richard Cartwright told you, they could not make Canada right by Act of Parliament, and if ever two men were vindicated they have been vindicated by what has taken place since. But, Sir, the Conservative orators who stumped the province of Ontario at that time told you that Sir John Macdonald had

A MAGIC WAND IN HIS HAND,

and that by simply waving it there would spring from ground the manufactories that would cover Ontario and give work to our sons who were seeking work on the other side of the line. Allow me to recall on this occasion the words that were then spoken. Sir John spoke in many places in that year, but the burden of

his song was the same everywhere, and you may imagine what it was by some words he spoke not very far from here, at Parkdale. He said :—

> Here we are, not only suffering depression in every trade and industry, but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufactories of the United States. Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well-educated people and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in those years and taken up their abode in the United States because they could not find employment here for their skill and energy and enterprise in consequence of the false policy of our rulers?

The Conservative press tell us there is no exodus. But in those days Sir John admitted that there was an exodus, and he said it was a crime and a shame. Well, Sir, I ask : If it was a crying shame in those days that there should be five hundred thousand of our fellow-countrymen on the other side of the line seeking employment, what shall we say of the men who pretended they could cure that evil, and have brought the number up, not merely to five hundred thousand, but to a round million ? But, Sir. I do not want to be hard on Sir John or his friends. It is better to be generous when you have them at your mercy. We have the advantage over him now. We can meet him with his own words. And, after all, perhaps he believed that he could, indeed, with the National Policy, which he was about to put on the statute book, provide a remedy for you. For, you know, there have been such instances in history —instances of men who, by stating a false proposition and repeating it,

AT LAST CONVINCED THEMSELVES

that it was true. You remember the story of old George the Fourth. He was fond of donning military clothes, though he never smelt the powder of the

field of battle. After the battle of Waterloo, he commenced to say that he was present,and he kept repeating it until at last he convinced himself that it was true. And not only did he convince himself that he was at the battle of Waterloo, but he gave examples of his dashing conduct while there. On one occasion he put the Duke of Wellington in a very awkward predicament. The King spoke to a person on one occasion of having been at the battle, and the person to whom he related the story did not seem wholly convinced of the truth of it. So the King turned for confirmation of his statement to the Duke of Wellington and said : " Is it not true, Arthur, that I was present at the battle of Waterloo ? " But the great Duke was equal to the occasion. He did not either admit or deny the King's statement, but answered : " I have often heard Your Majesty say so. " Or you do not know, perhaps, the story of the theological student who was fond of argument. One day, while walking with a fellow student, he wanted to have an argument on Christianity and infidelity. " What is the use of attempting that ? " said his friend, " for we are agreed on that point, we are both Christians." But he still insisted and told his friend to argue for Christianity, while he himself would argue for infidelity. And so he commenced to argue and he argued so well that he argued himself into infidelity. Well, I won't say that Sir John Macdonald wanted to humbug anybody, but

IF HE DID HUMBUG ANYBODY

into the belief that he could cure the emigration evil by the National Policy, I believe, in all charity, he began by humbugging himself. Now ten years have passed since that day, and I ask of all those who in those days believed indeed that the Liberals were flies on the wheel, what has been the result of the National Policy ? Men believed that Sir John could indeed create prosperity by act of Parliament in the

form of a policy of protection. We had an example a year or so afterwards, in 1880. One of his staunch followers, Mr. Rufus Stephenson, who was member for Kent and who is now—well I don't know what he is now, but at the last report he was drawing $5,000 a year out of the Canadian exchequer for inspecting colonization companies in the North-West that do not exist,—Mr. Rufus Stephenson said in 1880, speaking somewhere in Western Canada: "I am going to vote for the Government that has raised the price of wheat from 75 cents a bushel to $1.40." Well, as I said a moment ago, Mr. Stephenson is no longer in the political arena. If he was we might ask him:—Are your friends flies on the wheel? They raised the price of wheat at one time, it appears, from 75 cents to $1.40. Why don't they exert their power to-day? Why don't they bring up the price of wheat again? This is the reduction *ad absurdum* which shows the hollowness of the pretensions and promises which were made to you ten years ago. I blame no one, Mr. Chairman, for having believed those promises. But, as I blame no one for having believed them, he would be entitled to blame who, upon this occasion, would not rise superior to party claims, and express the opinion which must be in his breast, that their policy has been a failure and we must have a new departure. Sir, what must be the new departure? Sir Richard Cartwright indicated it during last session. We have tried the policy of restriction and it has failed, let us try the policy of expansion. The policy propounded by Sir Richard Castwright is that we should have unrestricted reciprocity with the sixty millions of men on the other side of the line. That policy is that we should open as wide as we can open all the avenues of trade between the two nations. Sir,

EXPERIENCE IS THE TEST OF ALL THEORY.

When we tried the National Policy ten years ago we had no experience, and some might assume that

these prophecies then made would prove true. But we have tried it for ten years and we have found it wanting. Not so, however, with reciprocity. We know what reciprocity can do, for we know what reciprocity has done in the past. We have had reciprocity before, not unrestricted but restricted reciprocity, confined only to natural products. And there is not one man in this audience who will not admit that the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty were the golden era of the Canadian farmer. Well, what restricted reciprocity did in the past it can do now. It is true that you are told that reciprocity, confined as it was to some natural products, made better times, and what it did before it must do to-day. Remember what you were told ten years ago. Ten years ago you were told that the National Policy would give you a local market; that there would be in the midst of you manufactories with thousands of artisans who would consume everything that would be grown by farmers, that the farmers would sell dear everything they had to sell, and buy cheap everything they had to buy. We had then two cities exceeding each

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND POPULATION

—Montreal and Toronto—and we have yet only two cities of over one hundred thousand population. On the other side, you have, in the Northern States alone, twelve cities of population exceeding one hundred thousand and comprising in all a population of four millions. There is your local market. You were told by the National Policy men that reciprocity would be of no benefit to the farmers, because they would have to compete with the American farmers in their own market, and they produce the same things that our farmers do. That is true; they do produce the same things, and the argument can be met in many ways. But I have better than argument to offer you. I did not come here—it may be presumptious in me to say it, but I make it a rule to speak my own mind—

to address my fellow-Liberals. It is the Conservatives I want to address. If they would take it without offence, I would say it is the sinners I want to convert. As I want to address myself to the sinners, I will give them an authority that to them will be more than the law and the prophets. I will give them the words of the great apostle himself, Sir John Macdonald, and they will be obdurate indeed if they find objection to what he says. In 1860, we were on the eve of an election. Sir John went around Ontario and spoke in many places. Here is something that he said at Hamilton. These are his very words, and I commend then to my fellow countrymen of the Conservative persuasion: --

> One great cause of the prosperity of the farmer in Upper Canada is the Reciprocity Treaty and the consequent interchange of agricultural commodities and raw materials. He has found a market where there was none at all before for him.

These are pretty conclusive words. We hear it said now by some disciples of Sir John that reciprocity would be a bad thing because we produce the same kind of goods that are produced on the other side of the line.. I want you to answer them

WITH THESE WORDS OF SIR JOHN.

Again, speaking at the other end of the province, at Caledonia, he said the same year:—

> If there is one measure of late date which benefits the country more than another it is the Reciprocity Treaty negotiated indeed by the Hincks Government, but perfected under Sir Allan's. You know that whereas wheat used to pay 20 cents a bushel to enter the frontiers of the United States, it now goes in free, and every farmer here is 20 cents a bushel richer for that measure. Instead of being kept out of the United States, and being obliged to go to Montreal to sell his produce, he has now the choice of two markets—he has two strings to his bow—no Collector of Customs stands between him and the

New England manufacturer or between him and the British consumer.

Who says that? Not *The Globe*. Sir John himself says that. Instead of being kept out of the United States and being obliged to go to Montreal to sell his produce, as it is now, the Canadian farmer has the choice of two markets. He has two strings to his bow. No Customs officer stands between him and the New England manufacturer and the British consumer. That is the very policy to which we wish to revert. That was the policy that twenty years ago made the farmer twenty cents richer upon every bushel he had to sell. That language is eloquent enough, but there is something still more eloquent—the figures of the trade which was done under the Reciprocity Treaty. In 1853, as you know, our trade with the United States —that was before the treaty—was only $21,000,000. In 1866, the last year of the treaty, that trade had increased to $84,000,000, an increase of $63,000,000. Certainly nothing could be more eloquent than these figures. They show one thing more. They show that the treaty was advantageous not only to the Canadians, but also to our American neighbours. It was, as every bargain should be,

MUTUALLY ADVANTAGEOUS.

Still the treaty was repealed, much to the regret of the Canadian people It was repealed by our neighbours to the south, and for what reason? Not because it was not advantageous; there was not a public man in the United States who ever pretended that the treaty was not advantageous to the American people. But it was repealed, I am sorry to say, from political reasons, on account of the unfriendly tone of Great Britain and Canada too, at the time of the great struggle which the Americans had to wage for the preservation of their national unity. It was when the great democratic nation to the south of us was

fighting for the abolition of slavery, for human rights, for the preservation of a great people. They never had any friendly response from the neighboring nation. I do not blame very much the people of my own race, for they do not conceive of liberty as people of the Anglo-Saxon race do. But if Great Britain is entitled to the reproach, Canada is entitled to it as well. Amongst the public men of Great Britain of that time only two, Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, openly advocated the cause of the North. And among the public men in Canada of that day only one openly championed the cause of the North, and that was George Brown. It is told among the traditions of the House of Commons that when upon a certain occasion the North had been defeated in a great battle there were cheers from the Conservative benches in the House of Assembly. The American people resented that course on the part of Canadians and said, if these people will not stand by us in our struggles we will not trade with them. But, Sir, better days have come since that time. Blood is thicker than water, and it is English blood that flows on the other side of the line; and now these feelings of asperity have disappeared, and there are to-day in the United States men who are ready to welcome Canadians to trade with the Americans upon even terms. We have in Congress, Mr. Hitt, Mr. Butterworth, Senator Sherman and Secretary Bayard. All those men have time and again said that they are ready to trade with us on even terms and to remove these customs officers who take so much, as Sir John Macdonald says, from the Canadian farmer.

Why is it that our Government—why is it that the Government of Sir John do not give the answer to those questions? Why do they not adopt the policy suggested by Sir Richard Cartwright—the policy of unrestricted reciprocity? They have given the reason more than once, and the reason they have given is this: That unrestricted reciprocity would not be

FAVORABLE TO THE MANUFACTURER.

Now, as you are no doubt aware, a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity would include natural products, and according to the language of Sir John, which I have quoted, that would be to the advantage of the farmers. But at the same time they say that while this policy would be to the advantage of the farmers it would be injurious to the manufacturer. Very well, I take issue upon that ground with them. If that policy which we propose, if the policy of unrestricted reciprocity would not be equally favorable to the manufacturer and the farmer, if a choice has to be made between the manufacturer on the one hand and the farmer on the other, my choice is made. I have stated it elsewhere and I will state it again. My choice is made, and I stand with the more numerous class, with the farmers, with that class which numbers at least seventy-five per cent. of our own people. But, at the same time, I do not admit at all that the policy which we propose would be injurious to the manufacturers. We have some manufactures to-day. Why have we not more? The reason is obvious:

WE HAVE NOT A MARKET

for those which exist already. You are told that it would be injurious to the manufacturer that the policy of expansion which we recommend should be adopted. I am not a manufacturer; but I can see, as any man of common sense can see, that the greatest possible obstacle to the success of manufactures is the lack of markets. You have some manufactures in Canada to-day—how many of them are working at their capacity? What we want, Mr. Chairman, is a market not only for the farmers, but for the manufacturers as well. There are wealthy manufacturers who understand this and who will some time or other give their views to the Canadian public; therefore I say when the Government allege that reciprocity would

injure manufactures, they do not know the views of manufacturers; more than that, the Government do not know their own minds. This is pretty loud talking, you will say. Well, I know whereof I speak when I say that the Government upon this question of unrestricted reciprocity do not know their own minds. We had an illustration of this truth last session. We have upon our statute book what is known as a statutory offer, whereby we said to the Americans that whenever they would put upon the free list certain articles exported by us we would do the same with the same articles when exported by them and imported into Canada. Well the Americans some time ago put upon the free list certain articles included in that statutory offer, namely, fruits and seeds. Our Government last year were asked why they did not respond to this action of the American Government and put fruits and seeds upon our free list also. Sir John's answer to Sir Richard Cartwright and to Mr. Mitchell was that those articles would not be put on the free list because such a policy would injure the Canadian seedsmen and fruit-growers. He said:

> I repudiate the statement that it is any breach of faith on the part of Canadian Government; and further, Mr. Speaker, I say that there have been representations made on behalf of the American seedsmen desiring that this should be carried out: but we know there are seedsmen in Canada also, and we have to consider their interests as well as those of American seedsmen, and in the interests of Canadian seedsmen we have not put seeds upon the free list.

Mr. Thompson, the Minister of Justice, went further and said that in his judgment it would be treason to put those articles on the free list. But what followed?

After such statements had been made on the floor of the House,

FIFTEEN DAYS HAD NOT PASSED

when Sir John put upon the free list fruits and seeds,

although there were Canadian seedsmen upon this side of the line. Well, Sir, when we found such a change between the words of the Government and their action, Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Mitchell took the Government to task and asked them what were the reasons which induced them to change their policy. Well, there was a scene in the House. Sir Richard Cartwright tried his best to get an answer from the Government, but never an answer could be got. Is it too much to say, then, that they do not know their own mind on this question? I hope, if we cannot get reciprocity in bulk, that we may get it piecemeal and in detail. But this agitation which we have commenced, I am glad to say, has already produced very remarkable fruits. It has made the National Policy men very loyal, very loyal indeed. Well, I never thought it very loyal to England to adopt the National Policy, which was calculated to exclude British manufactures from our own territory. But I speak my own mind upon this also. I do not blame the Conservatives for having acted that way. I believe that loyalty, like charity, begins at home and if they believed that it was in the interest of Canadians generally that the National Policy should be put upon the statute book, they did right to act as they did. But now they need not be so very sensitive, after having acted towards England as they did. But I know something of them. I read the prints of Ontario and I know that every day these people weep tears because they feel that if unrestricted reciprocity is adopted it must lead us into annexation. Well, I have only this to say: It is a great argument in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, because, if it means anything at all, it means that the change will be so advantageous to the people that they will want to go into the still closer union with the United States. But I have this to say to the National Policy men:

IF THEY WILL ANSWER FOR THEMSELVES,

I will answer for the Reformers, and the Grits. If

they will answer for their allegiance I will answer for it that there is not a Grit who will be seduced from his allegiance to the Queen by any Yankee blandishments that we can have. Well, as they started upon the loyalty line, they could not but carry it to extraordinary length. You know it never rains, but it pours. The moment they struck the line of loyalty they became very, very loyal. They want to have no reciprocity with the United States, the great nation to the south of us, for fear we might be seduced from our allegiance to the country. But they are ready, they say, for reciprocity with Great Britain. I have only this to say. I say it openly; I say it upon my own responsibility, and I believe I can speak as well for the Liberal party; if reciprocity with Great Britain is practicable, I am in favor of it. But Britain is 3,000 miles away, and the Americans are just to the south of us. They are our near neighbors, there is not a natural barrier between us. If Britain were where the United States is, I would go at once for reciprocity with Great Britain. But, Sir, it is very well to be sentimental, but, after all, sentiment is not business. If I go to one of these National Policy men and want to buy a dollar's worth of cotton and tell him I am one of his fellow-subjects, that I believe in the National Policy, that I am a loyal subject, that I am bursting with loyal sentiment and ask him if he will take that for his pay,

HE WILL REFUSE ME.

But if I offer him a Yankee dollar, he will take it just as readily as British cash. Therefore it is not enough to talk sentiment. We must talk business. The United States is just at the end of my hand. Moreover, we have the same tariff as it were; we have a protective tariff and for many years to come we must have a high tariff. Great Britain has a Free Trade tariff. What can we offer Great Britain in exchange if we want to have reciprocity? We have

heard the statement made in the House by Mr. McCarthy and others that perhaps Great Britain might resort to protection, might tax foreign products and exempt Canada. Well, if this were offered, I say I am ready for it.

If we can persuade the English people to put import taxes upon the productions of every other country but Canada, and to admit the products of Canada free, I am in favor of that. But I am afraid it will take some years before we can persuade the British workman to tax his bread, even to oblige his Canadian brother. But I will not dismiss that idea altogether. I will tell you what I believe. I do not believe it to be impossible that there should be a closer political union between Great Britain and Canada. I do not believe it to be impossible that there should be a commercial alliance between all the Anglo-Saxon nations. We know that the Anglo-Saxon race is the great commercial race of the world. It has taken possession of the North American continent; it has taken possession of Australia, of large portions of Africa, of many of the islands of the Pacific. I believe a time will come when those British communities will find it to their advantage to have amongst them universal Free Trade. I do not discuss that as a practical issue, but it is possible, and it is desirable; it would be better not only for those countries, but for the whole human race. And I say that if anything is calculated to bring about that result, it is the establishment of intimate commercial relations between the great English speaking peoples of this continent.

I BELIEVE IN CONFEDERATION.

I believe it has removed many of the troubles which grew up between Upper and Lower Canada. I believe that whatever a man's origin may be, he has the right to say that he is a Canadian above all things.

Now, to all those who oppose unrestricted reci-

procity, because they believe it would lead to annexation, I say, have some faith in human nature, have some faith in the better instincts of the human heart, trust the people, don't believe that evil will spring from good, that wrong will spring from right. Believe on the contrary that right will produce right. Trust the people of this country. If you believe the principle of unrestricted reciprocity is wrong, fight it, it is your duty. But, if you believe it is right, do not oppose it for fear it should produce evil. I say again, have faith in the people. Remember the struggles we had for responsible government fifty years ago. There were men in those days who believed that responsible government would mean the end of British connection on this continent. But there was a man who had no such fear, and that man was Lord Elgin. He carried out his ideas to the end. He left nothing undone that could be done. The result has been, not what was anticipated by these men, but the result his been to link Canada more closely to Great Britain. In the same manner, I say, let us repeat the same experience. Lord Elgin did more. There was at the time a powerful annexation agitation. These men who afterwards claimed to be so loyal, the Tories of the Tories, were signing annexation manifestoes. What did Lord Elgin do? Did he attempt to prevent intercourse between the United States and Canada? On the contrary he opened wide the doors to trade between the two countries, and the result was that the annexation agitation disappeared like a cloud before the sun. I anticipate the same result. I anticipate that the movement which we inaugurate to-day and which will triumph as sure as day succeeds to night, instead of being a danger to Confederation, will be the means of bringing us nearer the goal, which we started out twenty-one years ago to reach. Speaking as I do now, I beg to repeat that I do not address myself to the Liberals only. I address myself

TO THE CONSERVATIVES AS WELL.

I want them to ponder over these facts, and if they can do so, to influence Sir John Macdonald and his Government to take up the movement. I pledge myself that we will give them all the help we can. I am very sure it will be hard to convince the Conservative Government of to-day. But we know, Sir Richard Cartwright, who is the father of the movement, knows that no great reform has been carried without a fearful struggle.

We know that no great reform has been carried without struggles, without defeats. We are prepared for those struggles. When Sir Richard Cartwright proposed his resolution last session he knew that it would be defeated. He will renew it next session, and he knows it will be defeated then; he will renew it the session after that, and he knows it will be defeated; he will renew it again and again, but in the meantime there will be a general election, and we believe the result of that election will be the return of a majority, whether Conservatives or Reformers, pledged to support a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States. This is the policy which we have to place before the people. There are other issues, there are other questions, but every other question must take a back seat and leave the first place to unrestricted reciprocity. This is the cry. This is the reform which we press not only upon the people of Ontario, but especially upon the people of Halton, with the hope that the people of Halton will give no uncertain answer, but such an answer as will be a victory for the principles of the Liberal party.

THE FISHERIES' EMBROGLIO

REJECTION OF THE TREATY BY THE SENATE AT WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S MESSAGE

WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE THREAT OF RETALIATION?

The following extract from the speech delivered at St. Thomas (Ont.) on the 27th August, 1888, sums up in a few words the Liberal leader's opinion on the fisheries' question, as it presented itself, after the complete check received by the negotiations, which had dragged their slow and difficult length throughout the preceding winter. Exceptional importance was given to these declarations by the way in which the Tory press denounced Mr. Laurier as the greatest traitor in the country, because he had dared to trace up to the Canadian Government the original responsibility for all the unfortunate complications:

The American Senate has refused to ratify the treaty negociated between the American and British plenipotentiaries in Washington in last December for the settlement of the disputes between the two countries arising out of the treaty of 1818. By the fact that the treaty is rejected, the whole question is re-

opened anew, the whole dispute is coming back to the surface, all the bitterness is again coming to the front, is again revived. President Cleveland, acting upon what he conceived to be the duty imposed upon him by the American Senate, asks power to retaliate by suspending the bonding system. This would be a very serious event, which, if it came, would strike the city of St. Thomas as much and perhaps more than any other portion of the Dominion, because it is made what it is largely by the lines of railway which come here from the United States. But after all we are men and British men. We shall not whine even if the American people deem it advisable—I do not say their duty—to take such a course, such an unfriendly course. No doubt some parties will suffer in Canada, but no doubt, like British men, it is our duty to find elsewhere what we would lose. The president only asks to retaliate. Why retaliate? Why, sir, because in his judgement he would be compelled to do so by the unfriendly action of the Canadian Government. If we are met with this state of things with which we are threatened, it is due to the vicious policy of the Canadian Government in the administration of the rights secured to us by the treaty of 1818. If the Canadian Government had followed a more friendly course,there would not have been an unfriendly feeling to-day. The United States would never have contested those rights, if the rights had been asserted in a friendly manner. It was not so. Those rights had been asserted in a harsh manner. Time and again in the year 1885 American, fishermen were arrested for trivial offences.

Nothing, sir, could be more offensive to those people when they came to the British port and found themselves arrested, their vessels detained for the simple violation of Customs laws, which, in all probability, they did not know. It is no wonder that their hearts were bitter and that they made complaint at Washington. If, on the contrary, the Canadian Government had administered our laws as they con-

ceived them under the treaty, in a friendly manner, there could not have taken place what has taken place. We are threatened with the possibility that our carrying trade may be taken away from us, and we hear the Ministerial press from one end of the country to the other in a frantic passion on account of the action taken by the American Government. They say it is a loss. If the carrying trade is such a loss to the country, if the carrying trade is such an advantage to the country, is not that a most potent argument that the most unrestricted reciprocity of trade would be of very great advantage to the country? If the country gained so much by simply carrying goods from one part of the United States to another or from one part of the United States to Canada, what would not be the gain to the country if we could be admitted without obstruction to the American trade? Sir, I say this—and this is a fact to which I call the attention of my fellow-countrymen to-day—it is high time we should reverse the policy we have been following towards the United States for the past 25 years. For the past 25 years it has not been altogether hostile to the United States, but it has never been altogether friendly. It has not been such as to bind us to those on the other side of the line, who speak the same language and have the same ability with us.

When they were in the great struggle which they had to undergo some twenty years ago, to preserve the unity of the nation, when they were engaged in that most expensive war which lasted four years and which taxed all their energies and courage and which cost them millions of lives, what sympathy did they receive from their brothers in England or in Canada? Not the slightest. Sir, I am ashamed to say for my country, for the civilization of the world, when the Americans were engaged in such a struggle this civilized world did not rise to sustain them with the hand of friendship. Of those who favored the cause of the North and championed that of freedom, in England

the names of John Bright and Richard Cobden were about the only names in that day, ever in the foremost ranks of civilization and freedom, openly to declare for freedom, and in this country among the public men of that day there was one man and only one man who was always foremost in the ranks of freedom, who openly declared his sympathy with the North—George Brown. Is it any wonder, then, when this is all the sympathy they met with—that when the victories of the South were reported there was sympathy throughout the country, and even as I am told in the Legislature of Canada is it any wonder that these men's hearts were embittered, and when they came to this treaty they said: "We will no longer have those trade relations"? Did we at that time enter into anything like friendly relations with them? Sir, I remember again in the days of 1878 we adopted another policy, the braggadocio policy.

We were told by Sir Charles Tupper that the Government would find the way to compel the Yankees to grant reciprocity. What did Sir Charles Tupper say in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and in the House of Commons? He said that we would compel the United States to give us reciprocity. Canada is the land of my birth, of my love; Canada is the land of my heart, and it is enough for me. But it is not equal to the United States in extent; it has not even five million people and the Americans have a population of sixty millions; and to say, as was said by the Conservative leaders at that time, that we could compel that great nation to come down to their knees and to force them to give us what they have not been willing to give us so far, was simply the greatest piece of braggadocio that has been enacted within my lifetime. Again what took place? We had disputes with them on that treaty of 1818 with regard to the fisheries. Instead of adopting a friendly attitude, the Government did everything to annoy them. Is it any wonder, then, that they have been refusing to maintain those friendly relations which

would be to their interests and our interests? Again, I say it is high time we reversed our policy towards the United States. After all, blood is thicker than water. Those who live on the other side of the line come from the British Isles, as most of us do. Those who live on the other side of the line have the same literature and the same language. The time has come when there should be closer relations. Let us remain as we are politically, but let us agree that it would be for their benefit and for our benefit that there should be no Customs laws, but that we should exchange our produce from one side of the line to the other. This is the policy of the Liberal party. For my part, I believe that we look no longer on them with jealousy, that we are glad of their success, that we are sincere friends and brothers, and that we would have no difficulty in arriving at the object we have in view.

THE FISHERY DISPUTE

CANADA'S COMMERCIAL INTERCOURSE WITH THE UNITED STATES

COMPLETE VIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION

(HOUSE OF COMMONS)

SITTING OF 26TH FEBRUARY, 1889

MR. SPEAKER,

I now rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the question of the Fisheries, and to the position in which the relations between Canada and the United States stand with reference to this question. I submit at once, and it is a proposition to which no dissent will, I am sure, be offered, that there is not at this moment a more important question to Canada; and I submit at once also, that it is urgent that upon this question the Government and Parliament should speak promptly and with no uncertain sound. The only reference made to this subject by the Government at all since the opening of the session was the paragraph contained in His Excellency's Speech to the effect that since the Washington Treaty had not been ratified by the American

Senate, nothing remained for Canada to do but to continue to exercise her rights as prescribed by

THE CONVENTION OF 1818,

until some satisfactory adjustment was arrived at by treaty between the two nations. In the early days of the session, the honorable gentleman who represents the counties of Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) gave notice of a motion which was intimately connected with that subject. One would have expected that the Government would have availed themselves of the opportunity thus afforded them, to expose fully and minutely to the House the course they intended to follow and the policy at which they had arrived. But, when this motion was called, it was postponed once, twice, three times, four times and five times, and every time at the request of the Government. A few days later, when my honorable friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Davies), put the question to the Government whether they intended to continue or not the *modus vivendi*, the answer he received was the convenient, ever at hand, always serviceable answer: "under consideration." It must then have become evident to every man in the House that the Government, upon this question, had no policy to offer, that they hold, as they have held of yore upon that and many other questions, an irresolute, vacillating, halting and hesitating policy, and that they will continue such policy until the time for deliberation will be passed, until the time for action will well nigh have passed away, until every action, even if taken in the right direction, will be taken too late and probably remain barren of result, powerless, perhaps, to repair the possibly irreparable injuries that may have been done in the meantime. Under such circumstances, when the Government refuse to rise equal to the duty of the hour, when they refuse to discharge the duties which are incumbent upon them, it becomes

THE DUTY OF THE OPPOSITION

to come to the front, to clear the way, and to show t he Government what is the duty of the hour and what is the course which should be followed in the interest of the country at large. Were this a purely domestic question, the temptation would be great, perhaps, to fold our arms and to wait and profit by the ever-increasing embarrassement of the Government; but the issues are too great, the consequences are of too serious a character, and it is better, by far, to set aside all party tactics.

Sir John A. Macdonald:—Hear, hear!

Mr. Laurier:— Yes, better by far to lose all party advantage and to point out at once where the wrong is and where possibly may be obtained the remedy. What is the situation? At this moment there is an Act, which is the law of the neighboring republic, whereby at any moment the President of the United States is authorized to close to our ships all entry to American ports, nay, more, to prevent importations into the United States of any goods coming from Canada; and when we consider the fact that the exports last year of goods from Canada to the United States exceeded the sum of forty million dollars, we have the evidence at once of the magnitude of the possible evils which may await Canada, should such a policy be put in force. This is the situation as it now exists. Here are the two principal offsprings of that great mother of nations, England, standing side by side, with every inducement of blood, of common origin and of a common history extending back into ages, to stand together on terms of the most intimate friendship, yet with their relations having reached such a degree of bitterness and hostility that at any moment we may have commercial war. A few days ago, in another debate, the opinion was quoted of an honorable gentleman who occupies a very high rank in the estimation of his party and country, Sir Charles Tupper, to the effect that the line is very thin which separates

COMMERCIAL WAR FROM ACTUAL WAR.

His words may again be quoted as perfectly applicable to our present position. He said:—

> We stood face to face with a bill providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that bill meant commercial war. I need not tell you that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between the two countries, but that it involved much more. If that bill had been brought into operation by a proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates commercial war between the two countries from actual war.

Still, even not going so far as Sir Charles Tupper went on that occasion, the fact remains that the situation, even if it means nothing else than commercial war, is a most deplorable one. Well, for that situation I say that the Government of Canada is largely responsible. I do not say solely, but I say largely responsible. Justice and fairness compel me to say, and I say it frankly, that in many things the Government of the United States, in their conduct towards Canada, were as blameable as the Government of Canada were towards the United States. If I were an American and stood on the floor of Congress, I would deem it my duty to say to the American people how, where, and when their conduct has been wanting towards Canada in fairness and generosity. But I am a Canadian, and I stand here on the floor of Parliament, and I deem it my duty to show to the Government where they have erred, where they have committed wrong, and where in my estimation it is possible to undo the wrong which has been done. Sir, on this side of the House we are of the opinion that, from the moment the American colonies severed their connection with the mother land, the most satisfactory relations that ever existed between the mother land

and the new republic, and between that republic and Canada, were the relations which were created by the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. This is our belief, and upon that belief we act. We have made it

AN ARTICLE OF OUR PROGRAMME

to obtain, if possible, not merely a restoration, but an enlargement of that treaty. We have made it an article of our programme to convince, if possible, the two nations that it would be for their mutual benefit to restore and to enlarge the provisions of that treaty. There was a time not yet far distant, when to a large extent the Conservative party held the same views. They made those very views the basis of that system which since, by a strange misnomer, has been called the National Policy. The resolution introduced by the right honorable gentlemen, at that time sitting on this side of the House, which has been the gospel of the new doctrine, which has been more than the law and the prophets to his party, has been often quoted to this House, and I might be dispensed from quoting it again, but the memory of honorable gentlemen on that side of the House is so short, so defective, so deceptive, and so treacherous, that it may be an act of charity again to quote that motion, and to show them the downward career they have followed ever since. The motion, after reciting all the benefits which were to follow from the adoption of the vague, indistinct policy which was called the National Policy in those days, went on in the following language:—

> And moving as it ought to do in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually reciprocity of trade.

That was the aim—a reciprocity of trade—and what is the result? Non intercourse and a commercial war. Well, we believe that, as far as the honorable

gentleman meant to have reciprocity of trade, he could not have adopted a worse policy than the policy which he adopted to achieve the end he had in view. Be this as it may, we on this side of the House still believe that

THE GOLDEN ERA

of the commerce of Canada was the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty. It was not so only on account of the material prosperity which it assured to the people of Canada, but the treaty was also connected with other advantages, the importance of which no one can deny. First of all, it set at rest, for the time being, that ever vexing question of the fisheries. Then it tended to create and cement a growing amity between the two peoples. It is the individual experience, and it is the national experience as well, that amity will ever follow in the path of mutually advantageous trade relations; but, unfortunately, the growing amity, consequent upon that treaty, received a rude shock at the time of the civil war in the United States. It is a matter of history that, in that great struggle, when the existence of the republic was trembling in the scales of destiny, the sympathies of the Government of Canada, and of a large number of the people of Canada, were not on the side which fought for right, and which eventually triumphed. In this, however, the Government of Canada were not more remiss than the rest of the civilized world, because, in that great struggle between freedom and slavery, the heart of the civilized world did not beat in favor of the side which was in favor of freedom. Even England, which had only a few years before abolished slavery in her own dominions, abetted the cause of slavery by covert acts, as far as possible, though not by overt acts. It was not that England sympathized with slavery, or did anything but hold it in abhorrence, but there was something which England, or at least the governing class of England,

dreaded still more than slavery, and that was the democratic institutions of which the republic was the embodiment, and which were then on trial. Times move fast in our day. The England of 1889 is no longer the England of 1861. To-day, England is

ALMOST A DEMOCRATIC COUNTRY.

We have recently seen a scion of the English aristocracy attempting to organize a Tory Democracy. Who, in 1861, would have imagined it possible to see those two words combined? In that respect, the England of 1861 was very much the same as the England of 1775, and the state of feeling in that country in 1775, which led to the rebellion of the American colonies, is spoken of by Mr. Green as follows, in his 'History of the English people." Speaking of the tyrannical and despotic measures of the English Government, which finally drove the colonies into rebellion, he says:

> And behind all these grievances lay an uneasy sense of dread at the democratic form which the government and society of the colonies had taken. The Governors sent from England wrote back words of honest surprise and terror at the levelling principles of the men about them. To statesmen at home the temper of the Colonial Legislatures, their protests, their bickerings with the Governors and with the Board of Trade, their constant refusal of supplies when their remonstrances were set aside, seemed all but republican.

Those feelings which actuated the English Government and the English Parliament in 1775 were the feelings which actuated the governing classes of England in 1861. It was the same thing with the rest of the civilized world. A French writer said in the early part of this century, referring to the American republic: "just let that child grow out of her swaddling clothes." He prophecied that, before she reached maturity, she would be rent asunder by factions, and, when the rebellion broke out, the secret

of the sympathy manifested throughout the civilized world for the South was that there was a secret hope that the republic would be so rent as to go out of existence, and that the fragments would be held as a warning that purely democratic institutions could not be permanently embodied in a government. I can understand that being the feeling in European society, but I am at a loss to understand how it was that Canada, which in that day, as now, was a purely democratic country, did not throw its whole sympathy into the cause for which the North was then fighting. Not that we could do anything to help it. The North could fight its own battles. But if we had shown anything like sympathy with the supporters of the American Union in their struggles with rebellion, they would have given us their friendship in return, as they have always been ready to do to those who sympathized with them. But, finding

A HOSTILE PEOPLE ON THEIR BORDER,

the first thing they did, when they had the opportunity, was to cut us off from the reciprocal trade relations which we had with them. This is the first fault which, I think, has been committed by the Government of Canada in our relations with our neighbors. With the abolition of the treatry all the old quarrels, all the old difficulties in regard to the fisheries, were renewed. An occasion, however, soon arose which put into the hands of the Government of Canada an opportunity, to some extent, of restoring the facilities of trade between the two nations, and good fellowship at the same time. The close of the war had left many difficulties to be settled between England and the United States,and at last, as we all know,commissioners were appointed to settle those difficulties, and amongst the commissioners was one selected from Canada, the right honorable gentleman himself. Well, the Fishery question was one of the first and most important that the commission had to deal with. The

British plenipotentiary offered to settle that question by a restoration of the reciprocity treaty, but, as we can well imagine, the feeling of irritation in the United States was still such that that offer was rejected. Shortly afterwards, however, the American plenipotentiaries offered to settle the question by obtaining access to our fisheries in exchange of free trade in coal, salt, fish, and from the 1st of July, 1874, the article of lumber.

I am sorry to say that this offer, instead of being accepted, was asked by the British plenipotentiary to be supplemented with a money consideration, and that was refused. It is true, however, that the American plenipotentiaries had before that time offered to settle that question by a money payment. They seemed to have been willing to settle either by money payment or by trade facilities; our plenipotentiary on the contrary offered to settle with them by trade facilities supplemented by a money payment. This was refused, and finally, as we know, the question was settled for a time by granting to the Americans, for the space of twelve years, access, to our fisheries on the payment of a sum of money to be determined by arbritators, and free trade in fish. Well, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that, in my estimation, of all the ways in which that question could have been settled

THE MOST UNFORTUNATE

was the way which was adopted, the most unfortunate was to settle it by a money consideration. It must have been evident that what took place since must necessarily take place; that is to say, that as the terms stipulated and paid for had expired, the question would be re-opened with increased bitterness. However, this was done, and this was the second fault committed by our Government in the settlement of that question and the history of our relations with our neighbors. The right honorable gentleman at that time was in power, and shortly afterwards he lost

power. When my honorable friend beside me was in power, the right honorable gentlemen and his friends, being then in Opposition, turned savagely upon the Administration ; they attacked it with all the means which a perverted ingenuity could devise, and they thought it honorable warfare, in order, if possible, to make a point against the Government, to open against the United States a compaign of brag and bluster. I have quoted the resolution introduced at that time by the right honorable gentleman. Well, if the matter had gone no further than that, I would have not much to say ; but the resolution which was then introduced was intended to force the United States to give us the reciprocity which they would not give otherwise, and the feeling was intensified by the most violent speeches. Sir Charles Tupper, for instance, went to the Maritime provinces, and stated there that by adopting a policy of retaliation, by Canada building up a tariff wall against the Americans, we would in a few years bring the Americans to their knees and force them to give us reciprocity. In Prince Edward Island, he used the language again and again, and used it with some effect, because at that time the Islanders sent six representatives to this House, to help the Government to build that tariff wall which it was supposed was going to bring the Americans to their knees. I am glad to say, however, that since that time the people of Prince Edward Island have come to take a better view of the situation, and they now understand that in order to have reciprocity they must take some other way. Well, Sir, the least that can be said of our relations with our neighbors is that such language and such conduct was not calculated to promote good feeling between the two nations. If the Americans were disposed at that time to enter into negotiations with us, with a view to establishing

FREE TRADE BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES,

the very moment that Canada pretended to be able

to force them, that moment the Americans would stiffen their backs, and refuse to give to threats what they might have been disposed to give to negotiations. But that language had its effect in Canada. The Canadian people, believing the promise held out to them by the Conservative party then in Opposition, returned that party to power, and gave them an opportunity to build their tariff wall and to establish a reciprocity of tariffs. They did so, and what was the result? Why, the result was that in a few years, instead of opening the American markets to free trade, the first thing the Americans did was to take an opposite policy and to abolish the fishery articles of the Washington treaty, to cut off from us what litle advantage we had under that treaty, and to bring back the state of affairs which had before existed. This was a serious matter. When the Americans gave notice to the Government of Canada that they would not continue the fishery stipulations of the Washington treaty, the Government had before them a great duty to perform. And how did they perform that duty? They performed it by

A POLICY OF MASTERLY INACTIVITY;

they never budged; they never stirred; they observed upon the question a conspiracy of silence, remaining serenely indifferent as to what might be the consequences of the attitude of the United States. When we on this side reminded them that they had a duty to perform, when they were asked from this side to act, to do something, anything, to meet the new situation that had arisen, what was their invariable answer? Their answer always was: "Hush! hush! hush! don't ask for information; don't ask for anything whatever; leave the matter to us; you do not know what harm you may do to an international question of this sort, by asking for infortumation; do not force our hands; leave it to us; everything will all come out right in time." They never stirred a

finger in order to meet the new situation which was about to face them. Seeing this inaction on the part of the Government, we on this side of the House attempted to do, in 1884, what we are doing at this moment; in face of the inactivity of the Government we attempted to clear the way, and to show them the duty which lay before them. My honorable friend behind me, from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), moved a resolution, in 1884, to which I call the special attention of the House, because it shows how the Government were guilty in that respect. The resolution was couched in the following language:—

In view of the notice of the termination of the Fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing, and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with the addition of reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries, and that in any such negotiations Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government.

Here was a policy clearly indicated by the Opposition, by my honorable friend from Prince Edward Island, that the Government should at once enter into negotiations in order not only to meet the difficulty, but to meet it by an extension of trade facilities. What was the answer? The answer was just what I said a moment ago: Keep silent, do nothing, leave every thing to us, I cannot do better than quote the language used by the right honorable gentleman on that occasion, He summed up his argument in the following words:—

But the honorable gentleman says that the United States have shown a desire to extend their trade by having a reci-

procity treaty with Mexico and the Sandwich Islands, who commenced negotiations in these cases? Was it the Sandwich Islands and Mexico? No; it was the Government of the United States in both instances, who was desirous of getting control of the trade of those two nations, inferior in population, inferior in wealth, and very much subject to American influences. They desired to increase that influence and to obtain control of the trade of those two nations, but it was not King Kalakaua, it was not the President of Mexico, who wanted the treaty; it was the Government of the United States that pressed upon those almost auxiliary nations and forced upon them, almost forced upon them, those treaties. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we must to a certain extent pursue the same course.

"I think we must to a certain extent pursue the same course and in the same manner as the Government of the United States," was the reply. That Government went to Mexico and the Sandwich Islands in order to obtain treaties of commerce with them; we must follow the same course and wait until the Government of the United States approach us, or, indeed, force the Government of the United States to come to us and ask us also to negotiate with them new commercial treaties. I cannot say I was surprised at that language. It was exactly in accordance with the policy always pursued by the honorable gentleman and his Government; it was the same policy which had been inaugurated in 1877, to force the Americans to come to us and not allow Canada to go to the Americans. The Government had a policy by which they were going to force the Americans to come to us; they have put it into effect piece by piece. First, they erected a tariff wall around this country; but that not being sufficient they made an addition. And what was that? The unwarrantable manner in which they commenced to execute the convention of 1818. I take issue with the right honorable gentleman upon this, and I say that, in my estimation, no greater fault was ever committed by his Government than in the way they carried out the convention of 1818 in 1885. They refused to ship the fish of Americans in bond.

They seized their schooners for alleged or trivial offences of the customs law, and they placed upon the convention of 1818 the narrowest construction it was possible to put upon it, a construction so narrow, and in some cases so inhuman, that there are instances where schooners were forced back to sea without being allowed the privilege of buying a single article of food in a Canadian port. They expected to bring down the Americans by that policy. What was the result? The result was the Retaliation Bill—the Bill which was passed in 1887, when the American Congress authorized the President at any moment to sever commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada. The Government had not anticipated that action. Still they did not move. But it is well for Canada that there is in the United States a Canadian with a true Canadian heart, a man who has the honor of being daily abused by the Conservative press of this country, a man whose name, when it was mentioned the other day in connection with this very subject, was received with jeers, to their shame be it said, by the majority of this House. Erastus Wiman stepped to the front, and he did then what should have been done long before by the Government of Canada—he constituted himself ambassador for Canada to the United States, and had an interview with Mr. Bayard.

Some honorable members:—Oh! oh!

Mr. Laurier:—Is there any dissent expressed to that? Have honorable gentlemen opposite forgotten their own history? Have they forgotten the language which was used not later than twelve months ago by Sir Charles Tupper in this House? Have they forgotten the praise given on that occasion to Mr. Wiman by Sir Charles Tupper? If they have, let me recall the language used on that occasion by Sir Charles. He said:

I know this, that a mutual friend—I have no objection to mentioning that it was Mr. Wiman—at an early day after

this speech was delivered, intimated to me that he had had a long conversation with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr Bayard, and that that gentleman had said that he would be very glad to have an opportunity of discussing the mutual relations of Canada and the United States with either my right honorable friend the Premier of Canada or myself.

Some honorable members :—Chestnuts!

Mr. Laurier :—Chestnuts, says an honorable gentleman. Sir, I am really surprised that on a subject of such vital importance as this, so much levity should be displayed. But this is quite in keeping with the policy of the Government which honorable gentlemen opposite follow. If Mr. Wiman on that occasion had not stepped to the front, what would have been the consequences? I do not know, but the Government, at all events, thought it fit and proper at last to move, and they commenced to act upon the suggestion and the action of Mr. Wiman, and promptly Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington. He did what should have been done years ago, and he had an interview with Secretary of State Bayard. It is proper to refer to the correspondence which was the consequence of that interview between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard. It originated in a letter written by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, and in which is to be found a very significant paragraph:

I am confident we but seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country

To this paragraph Sir Charles Tupper responded in a similar spirit:

My Dear Mr. Bayard,

I had great pleasure in receiving your letter of May 31, evincing as it does the importance which you attach to an

amicable adjustment of the fisheries question and the maintenance of the cordial commercial relations between the United States and Canada, under which such vast and mutually beneficial results have grown up. I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straighforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries.

It is a matter of history that, in consequence of that correspondence, commissioners were appointed to meet at Washington to settle that question. And when they met, Sir Charles Tupper, remembering the paragraph which I have just quoted, remembering the spirit which had dictated that correspondence between himself and Mr. Bayard, was prompt in asking from the American plenipotentiaries a settlement of the question upon the very basis which had been laid down by Mr. Bayard—that is to say, a commercial basis. He made the following propositions:—

That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland.

Such was the proposition made by Sir Charles Tupper, and this proposition was in conformity with the proposition contained in the letter of Mr. Bayard to him. For what reason and for what cause was this proposition rejected by Mr. Bayard and the American plenipotentiaries? Simply on account of the policy which honorable gentlemen opposite had followed in regard to the Fishery Treaty, simply on account of the irritation which had been caused in the United States

BY THE HARSH AND INHUMAN MANNER

in which that treaty had been carried out. Perhaps, Sir, that will be disputed also, but, if disputed, I can bring an important witness to support my statement, and my witness on this occasion will be Sir Charles Tupper himself. Speaking of this very fact and explaining the reason why the offer he had made had not been accepted, Sir Charles Tupper used the following words:—

> Mr. Bayard and those other gentlemen said that "there is only one way to reach this (for Congress alone can take the duty off any article), and on account of the exasperation that has been excited in this country by those fishery difficulties, you have seen the result, you have an unanimous Bill passed by the House of Representatives and passed by the Senate and assented to by the President, you have to meet what they hold was the inhospitable conduct (they used good deal stronger terms in some of their State papers, I am very sorry to say) of Canada in reference to the treatment of their fishermen, our representatives have said that they would never purchase from Canada any immunity for their fishermen by reciprocal trade arrangements," imbued, as their minds were, with the idea that we had adopted that policy to force reciprocity upon them.

Now, Sir, you have the opinion of the man best qualified to give evidence upon that subject, that the reason why the free trade relations which were touched upon by Mr. Bayard in his correspondence with Mr. Tupper were not carried out, was just on account of the policy which had been followed by honorable gentlemen opposite upon that very question. The right honorable gentleman and his Government have always prided themselves upon their superior wisdom and statesmanship, but upon this occasion I ask, where was the wisdom and where was the statesmanship? If the motion that my honorable friend behind me (Mr. Davies) made in 1884, when he suggested that the Government should send a commissioner to Washington in order to settle this ques-

tion, had been adopted, then, Sir, does it not follow from what I have stated that there was a chance to be heard and a chance of obtaining what we had in view? At that time the Government would not yield to the pressure put upon them. They would not send a commissioner to Washington, but three years later they were forced to send one, and upon that occasion, as on many other occasions when they acted, it was too late. If the Government had then acted in time they would have obtained some result; but they refused to act in time, and

THEY LOST EVERYTHING.

To day we see the same policy still pursued, the same policy of procrastination, and we are forced upon this occasion to suggest what, in our judgment, is the true policy that should be followed in the interest of Canada. What followed the result of the last negotiation at Washington? The treaty was rejected, it is true, and rejected by the American Senate, which had the power to deal with this question. Then came the celebrated Message from President Cleveland—and there is this to be said in favor of the President's Message, that he simply suggested (since he might be called upon at any time by the action of this Government to put the Retaliation Act in force) that a milder course should be adopted than the course demanded then. President Cleveland simply said to the American nation: "I may be called upon at any moment to put that Act into force, but I cannot put that Act into force without, to a large extent, injuring American trade. There is a better way to reach the Canadian people, since they refuse to carry our fish in bond. Instead of shutting out all their imports it would be better for us to prevent them carrying their goods in bond upon our railways." Such, however, was the bitter sentiment of the American people against us at that time, that Congress refused to act upon the suggestion of President Cleveland. No-

thing came of his suggestion ; the Act remains in force and at this moment we are just in this position : that to-morrow, or the day after to-morrow, the new administration may at any time, if they choose, cut off altogether the existing commercial relations between Canada and the United States. Again I ask : What is to be done ? What is the policy that ought to be followed by Canada ? I say to the Government,

REVERSE YOUR POLICY,

give up the policy of harshness which you have been following hitherto, and adopt the policy of conciliation ; admit that you have been in the wrong, and endeavor, not by threats or by acts of violence, to obtain reciprocity of trade with that country, but endeavor to obtain it by negotiation and peaceable means. I am aware, from my past experience, that in daring as I do now, upon an international question, to say to the Government that they were in the wrong, and to say that the other nation was in the right, I will bring once more upon my head all the thundering indignation of the Conservative press and party. Be that as it may, I hold that there is all the more reason to speak upon the question, because it is an international question. Because the consequences may be graver, there is all the more reason to act, and to act promptly, and to speak in no uncertain tones. I know very well from my past experience of the manner in which the Conservative party of this country have always understood party allegiance, that it is an act of disloyalty, that it is an act of treason to attack Ministers who shield themselves behind the sacred name of country ; but, Sir, I say without offence, that I do not care for the Ministers, but I do care for my country, which may suffer from their conduct. The tactics of the Conservative party are not new, they have always been the same, and it has always been held disloyalty and treason to attack the Conservative Ministers, even though it be to save the country.

There was a time in the history of England when the American people, then colonists of England, were forced into rebellion by the harsh conduct of the British Government and by the tyrannical measures of the Imperial Parliament. There was, also, at that time the greatest Englishman of his day—a man who has done more than any man of his time to launch England on that career of military and commercial aggrandizement which has since signalized her course. Lord Chatham never ceased to call upon the Government, and on the English Parliament, to retrace their steps, and to abandon their policy of harshness and adopt

THE POLICY OF CONCILIATION.

These gentlemen on the other side of the House have such slavish opinions—and I can use no other word but slavish—of loyalty, that it may not be amiss if I put before them the language used by Lord Chatham, the greatest Englishman of his time. He had to speak upon the policy which had driven the American colonists into rebellion; and he was speaking at a time when those colonists were in arms, fighting against His Majesty King George III. On one occasion he made use of this language:—

> Every motive, therefore, of justice and of policy, of dignity and of prudence, urges you to allay the ferment in America—by a removal of your troops from Boston—by a repeal of your Acts of Parliament—and by the demonstration of amicable dispositions towards the colonies. On the other hand, every danger and every hazard impend to deter you from perseverance in your present ruinous measures.

On the same occasion he made use of the following language:—

> We shall be forced ultimately to retract; let us retract while we can, not when we must. I say we must necessarily undo these violent oppressive acts; they must be repealed; you will repeal them; I pledge myself for it, that you will in the end repeal them.

They were repealed two years later, but they were repealed too late. Repealed in time, they would have had some effect; repealed too late, they only encouraged the American colonies to persevere in their action. On another occasion he made use of this no less significant language:—

> If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms, never! never! never!

Sir, this language was held to be treason at that time; such language would be held to be treason to-day. At that time it was held to be treason by the whole Conservative party, and still more by that well meaning, short-sighted, thick-headed Tory, King George III. He called Lord Chatham

A TRUMPET OF SEDITION;

yet, if the voice of that trumpet of sedition had been heeded at that time, King George III would have saved to the British Crown the loss of those royal domains which England has ever since deplored. Well, Sir, the loyalty of that great man which does not pander to prejudices, which does not court the favor of king or mob, but which speaks the truth whenever the truth is called for, this is the loyalty of this side of the House. It is in the name of that loyalty I now speak; and, doubly encouraged by the language of that great man, I say to the Canadian Ministry of this day that they are repeating the same fault which was committed by the English Ministry of 1775, and in the same terms I appeal to them to retrace their steps and take a new course. If you ask me, Mr. Speaker, to come down to practical measures and to say what I would recommend, I answer: The Government themselves admit that a new treaty has be negotiated. They say so in the Speech from the Throne, where I find this language:—

> It now only remains for Canada to continue to maintain

her rights as prescribed by the convention of 1818, until some satisfactory readjustment is arranged by treaty between the two nations.

That Speech was made on the 31st of January. They then contemplated acting under the convention of 1818. I am glad to see that, though to some extent they have not been able since then to come to any different decision, yet they have wavered a little in their opinion. When they were asked by my honorable friend behind me, a little while ago, whether they intended to put into force the *modus vivendi*, they said it was under consideration. They did not know whether they would or would not. Well, let us help them along a little, and let us say that, in our judgment at least, since they are to negotiate a new treaty, they should not go back and act upon the harsh clauses of the convention of 1818, but rather upon the more generous clauses and dispositions of the *modus vivendi*. If you are to negotiate a new treaty, it stands to reason, if you commence to harass American fishermen by the enforcement of the clauses of the convention of 1818, that that would be

A VERY SORRY PRELUDE

to all our negotiations. But if you go to Washington with the generous treatment provided under the *modus vivendi*, there is some reason to believe that an agreeable and satisfactory solution of the difficulty may be arrived at, in the only manner which would be satisfactory to both nations, that is to say, upon a basis of freer commercial relations between the two countries. Sir, there is every inducement for that policy. I give it as my deliberate opinion that, ever since the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, the relations of the two countries have never been satisfactory; they have never been openly hostile, but they have never been avowedly and generously friendly, always characterized by petty annoyances and vulgar bick-

erings ; and, unfortunately, that state of things has also extended to the relations between the mother land and the republic. Nothing, I am sure, could be more painful to every friend of England than the hostility displayed during the last presidential contest towards England. It is my deliberate opinion that this hostility, displayed at this date towards England by the American people, is a blot on the fair fame of the United States just as much as the hostility displayed during the civil war by England towards the United States was a blot on the fair fame of England. It behooves us, situated as we are in this country, having the relations we have to the mother land, and connected geographically as we are with the United States, to help to create

A BETTER PUBLIC SENTIMENT

in the two countries towards each other; and this view is largely shared, I am glad to say, by the whole Anglo-Saxon race in the two hemispheres. Though there are at this moment these unpleasant characteristics in the relations between England and the United States, there are no two nations in the world to-day which are so closely allied. Their trade is daily increasing, and to-day it already exceeds the trade of any other two nations. More than this, their intellectual life is every day getting more and more intimately interwoven. Books—all those important books which the literary world awaits on the tiptoe of expectation—are published simultaneously in London and New-York. Actors exchange boards ; preachers exchange pulpits ; there is no artistic or literary fame originated in one country which is safe and secure until it has been sanctioned in the other. While all these facts are healthy, I, for my part, would want Canada to step into the movement, to turn a new leaf in her history, to forget the past, and to do her share to reach that which must be, I suppose, and I hope, the ultimate object, namely, closer and ever closer

union between all countries of British origin and British institutions. With these views, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"In view of the rejection by the Senate of the United States of the Washington Treaty of 1888, and the unfortunate and regrettable differences existing between Canada and the United States on the Fishery and Trade questions, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken, at an early day, by the Government of Canada, for the satisfactory adjustment of such differences, and the securing of unrestricted freedom in the trade relations of the two countries, and that, in any negotiations entered upon for such purposes, Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government.

That, in the meantime, and to permit of such negotiations being favorably entered on, and to afford evidence of the anxious desire of Canada to promote good feeling, and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, this House is of opinion that the *modus vivendi* proposed on behalf of the British Government to the Government of the United States with respect to the Fisheries should be continued in operation during the ensuing fishing season.

THE JESUITS' ESTATES

MR. MERCIER'S LAW RATIFIED BY PARLIAMENT

MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH AGAINST THE "VETO"

On the 26th March, 1889, Mr. O'Brien, member for Muskoka, made the following motion in the Commons:

"That all after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, setting forth: 1. That this House regards the power of disallowing the Acts of the Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces, vested in His Excellency in Council, as a prerogative essential to the national existence of the Dominion; 2. That this great power, while it should never be wantonly exercised, should be fearlessly used for the protection of the rights of a minority, for the preservation of the fundamental principles of the constitution, and for safe-guarding the general interests of the people; 3. That in the opinion of this House, the passage by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec of the Act entitled 'An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates' is beyond the power of that Legislature. Firstly, because it endows from public funds a religious organization, thereby violating the undoubted constitutional principle of the complete separation of Church and State and of the absolute equality of all denominations before the law. Secondly, because it recognizes the usurpation of a right by a foreign authority, namely, His Holiness the Pope of Rome, to claim that his consent was necessary to empower the Provincial Legislature to dispose of a portion of the public domain, and

also because the Act is made to depend upon the will, and the appropriation of the grant thereby made as subject to the control of the same authority. And, thirdly, because the endowment of the Society of Jesus, an alien, secret and politico-religious bo ly, the expulsion of which from every Christian community wherein it has had a footing has been rendered necessary by its intolerant and mischievous intermeddling with the functions of civil government, is fraught with danger to the civil and religious liberties of the people of Canada. And this House, therefore, prays that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to disallow the said Act."

This motion was, after a long debate, rejected on a division of 188 to 13.

MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH

(SITTING OF THE 28TH MARCH)

MR. SPEAKER,

It is not often that we on this side of the House can have the privilege of supporting the policy of the Government. In this instance, when the action of the Government is assailed by a number of their supporters, when their action has already caused an agitation which unfortunately is not unmixed with religious bitterness, not one word certainly will fall from my lips which would tend to fan those religious flames; and I may say at once, repeating what was said this afternoon by my honorable friend from Bothwell(Mr. Mills),in the admirable speech he delivered, that the course of the Government receives, with a few exceptions which I respect, the entire support of the L,beral party. No other courseiMr. Speaker, than the course which we intend to take on this side of the House, would be consistent with the policy which we have been advocating for the last fifteen or twenty years —nay,ever since Confederation has been in existence. And, Sir, I hasten at once to congratulate the Government upon the fact that at last they have come to the true policy which they have often fought

against, that the only basis upon which we can successfully carry on this Confederation is to recognize the principle of provincial rights. And I cannot but say also that if the Government to day have to face this trouble in their own camp, if they have to meet this agitation which is now going on in the Province of Ontario, and of which the honorable member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said yesterday we have not seen the last, it is due altogether

TO THE VICIOUS POLICY

which has been followed by the Administration, and before the consequences of which they have at last to recede; it is due altogether to the manner in which they have governed this country, and to the means they have used to obtain a majority to support them. Sir, this is not a party question; it is at most a family quarrel; it is simply a domestic disturbance in the ranks of the Conservative party. A section of the Conservative party now require the Government to stand up or to stand down, whichever it may be, to the exigencies of the doctrine of disallowance, such as the Government has taught it, and such as the Government more than once called upon them to act upon. Well, there must always be a day of retribution, and that day I think is coming for the Government. The two chief provinces of which this Confederation is composed are vastly dissimilar. One is French in origin; the other British. One is Catholic in religion; the other is Protestant. And in each are to be found the prejudices peculiar to the creed and race of each. I say prejudices, and I use the word advisedly, nor do I use it in any contemptuous sense, for everybody must recognize the fact that, wherever you find strong convictions, you generally find an exaggeration of feeling very apt to carry men beyond the legitimate consequence of their convictions. Now, ever since the year 1854, I charge against the Government and against the Conservative party that they have been

able to retain power, almost without interruption, largely by pandering to the prejudices of the one province and the prejudices of the other province. In the good Catholic province of Quebec, to which I belong, the party supporting the Administration have always represented themselves as the champions of the Roman Catholic cause. They have always denounced their opponents, the Liberals of French origin like myself,as men of dangerous doctrines and tendencies. They have always represented the Liberals of Ontario as men actuated in all their actions and inspirations by a hatred of everything French and Catholic. At the same time, in the good Protestant Province of Ontario, the same party has always been held up to the front as the party of unbending and uncompromising Protestantism and the Conservative press today represent honorable gentlemen on this side as basely pandering to the influence of the French people and of the Catholic persuasion. Now this game has been for a long time successful, but, perhaps, before going further, I may recall this fact, known by all those who are now listening to me, that

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

of Ontario has always been just what I represent it to be. It may not be so well known that, at the same time, the Liberals of Ontario are charged by the Conservatives of the province of Quebec, not with pandering to the Catholic influence,but with being hostile to Catholic influence—and so the charges work both ways.

In one Province the Liberals are charged with one offence, and in the other with another. I could quote columns upon columns of the press which supports the right honorable gentleman to prove what I say, but I shall limit myself to one short paragraph. The school question in Ontario is a burning question. The honorable member for Bruce (Mr. McNeil) yesterday spoke almost of nothing else. A few days ago

there was in the Legislature of Ontario a debate upon this very question. The Government of Mr. Mowat were charged by the Conservative party with unduly favoring the teaching of the French language in the schools of Ontario. The debate was commented upon in the province of Quebec; *La Minerve*, one of the papers which support the Administration, an organ of the Conservative party, referred as follows to this very debate:—

The motion of the honorable member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) was followed by a most brilliant reply strongly conceived, broad in view and conclusive, from the Honorable G. W. Ross, Minister of Public Instruction. Mr. Ross is a Grit of the clearest water, but we are too much accustomed to the Gallophobic denunciations of that party and to the intemperance of their language, when the Province of Quebec is in question, not to rejoice at anything which remotely or approximately can look like a conversion.

You see the gist of this statement. It was charged that the language of Mr. Ross was an exception, whereas the charge made by the Conservative party in Ontario against the Administration for which Mr. Ross spoke was the very thing which is given him here as an exception. So it has always been. The party has

ALWAYS HAD TWO FACES—

a rigid Protestant face turning towards the west, and a devout Catholic face turning towards the east. In the province of Ontario, the rallying cry of the party has always been: "Protestants, beware! these Grits are weak Protestants!"

Some honorable members:—No, never.

Mr. Laurier:—Among the Protestants of Quebec, their cry has always been: "Catholics, beware, the Liberals are weak and bad Catholics!" This game has been successful for a long time, but it cannot always be successful, and I say the day of retribution

is now coming. I say that this motion which we now have is in many senses much to be deprecated, and I endorse every word which fell the other day from the honorable member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). It seems to me that all he said then were words of wisdom, but at the same time I cannot resist the conviction that the Government of to-day are only reaping what they have been sowing. They have allowed a large class of the Protestant population of Ontario to look upon them as the champions of Protestantism. They have affirmed the doctrine of disallowance among that section of the party and now that section cries out: We have always looked upon you as the champions of Protestantism; here is legislation which we deem offensive to the Protestant interest and to the interest of the country at large, and we call upon you to exercise those powers of disallowance which you have so often exercised in the past. Well, as far as the Liberal party is concerned, their attitude upon this question was known before it was explained in this debate. The Liberal party always endeavors to meet those questions, from a point of view that would include all different religious interests. Among the many questions which divided the two parties, there is no one upon which the policy of the two parties has been so clearly cut as upon this. The Conservative party, led by the right honorable gentleman, have always held the doctrine that they have the right to review the legislation of any Local Legislature. We, on the other hand, have always pretended that the only way to carry out this Confederation is to admit the principle that within its sphere, within the sphere allotted to it by the constitution,

EACH PROVINCE IS QUITE AS INDEPENDENT

of the control of the Dominion Parliament, as the Dominion Parliament is independent of the control of the Local Legislatures.

On the contrary, the honorable gentleman has

maintained again and again upon the floor of this House and by administrative acts that he claimed the power to review local legislation, to see whether it was right or wrong, and, if he found it clashing with his ideas of right, to set it aside. We all remember the famous Streams' Bill. What was the language used on that occasion by the honorable gentleman? He claimed that it was a question of purely provincial character, that it was one which was clearly within the competence of the Legislature of Ontario, and yet the honorable gentleman took it upon himself to disallow it, and for what reason? For no other reason than that the act clashed with his own opinions of what was right and what was wrong? He spoke as follows in regard to it:—

> But here, where we are one country and all together, and we go from one province to another as we do from one county to another and from one town to another, is it to be borne that laws which bind civilized society together, which distinguish civilivation from barbarism, protect life, reputation and property, should be dissimilar; that what should be a merit in one province should be a crime in another, and that different laws should prevail?

Upon that occasion the honorable gentleman took upon himself to review the law of the province, and, finding it was not consistent with what he believed to be right, he disallowed it. It shocked the tenderness of the right honorable gentleman's conscience that the Legislature of Ontario provided that Mr. Caldwell could not pass his logs through Mr. McLaren's improvements without paying toll, though the Privy Council afterwards decided that, without the law, Mr. Caldwell could have used those improvements without paying any tolls at all. The honorable gentleman now comes to the doctrine which has been very many times advocated on this side of the House, that he has not to consider whether this provincial legislation is good, bad or indifferent; it is altogether within the competence of the Local Logislature of

Quebec, and therefore, says he, let it pass. Let us read the report of the Minister of Justice of the day on the Streams' Bill and compare it with the report of the Minister of Justice upon the present occasion. The Minister of Justice said :—

> I think the power of the Local Legislature to take away the rights of one man and vest them in another as is done by this Act, is exceedingly doubtful, but, assuming that such right does, in strictness, exist, I think it devolves upon this Government to see that such power is not exercised, in flagrant violation of private rights and natural justice, especially when, as in this case, in addition to interfering with private rights in the way alluded to, the Act overrides a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, by declaring retrospectively that the law always was, and is, different from that laid down by the court.

Now, let us look at the report of the Minister of Justice in the present case. It is extremely short and sweet. The Minister of Justice simply says, referring to some petitions asking for disallowance :—

> Before the petition in question came before him for his consideration the undersigned had already recommended to Your Excellency that the Act in question should be left to its operation. The memorials referred to have not convinced the undersigned that that recommendation should be changed. The subject-matter of the Act is one of provincial concern only, having relation to a fiscal matter entirely within the control of the Legislature of Quebec.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is

SOUND LIBERAL DOCTRINE.

This is the very doctrine which has been always maintained and supported on this side of the House, and once more I beg to tender my thanks and my congratulations to the honorable gentleman on having at last come to the true and only basis upon which this constitution of ours can be satisfactorily maintained and supported. It takes a long time,

however, for a true principle to penetrate the perverted minds, as I might say, of the honorable gentlemen opposite. No, I beg their pardon, it does not always take so long a time; sometimes the operation is as fast as at others it is slow. Only three weeks ago, we tendered advice to the Administration as to the manner in which they should treat our friends to the South in reference to the *modus vivendi*. Our advice was treated with contempt, and it was stated by honorable gentlemen opposite that the proposal would be received with scorn by the people of this country; and yet, within three weeks, they have changed their minds and accepted the policy which we suggested. I can only say that, as long as the Administration continue to act in that way, first to reject the policy of the Opposition and then to steal our clothes and dress themselves in them, the country would not be the loser. I had hesitated, before I resolved to speak on his question, whether I should confine myself to this statement and then sit down, but I cannot ignore, no one who has at heart the interests of this country, the peace and harmony of this country, can ignore the agitation which is now going on in the province of Ontario. Coming as I do from the province of Quebec, being a member of the Catholic persuasion and a supporter of the Government which passed the legislation, I cannot but view with deep concern the attempt which is now being made to arouse our Protestant fellow-citizens in the province of Ontario against that legislation. Let me say this, which must be obvious to every honorable member, that, if we approach this question, or any question, from the point of view of the religious opinions which any of us profess, we are apt to stand upon very narrow, very unsafe, and

VERY DANGEROUS GROUND.

I say dangerous ground because it is a matter of history, that it is always in the sacred name of religion

that the most savage passions of mankind have been excited and some of the most shocking crimes have been committed. In this matter, I cannot forget the fact, as I have stated, that an attempt has been made to arouse the feelings of the province of Ontario, but I hope that that attempt will not carry, and that a better sentiment will prevail; I hope that the temperate language which we have heard to-day, will be understood, and, though this legislation may be objectionable to some people, yet that every one will understand that in these subjects we must make allowance for the feelings of others. What is the cause of the agitation which is now going on? What is the cause of the legislation which has been the source of so much turmoil? Sir, it is simply this: It is a matter of regret that the European nations, France and England, when they came to this continent, brought with them not only their laws and institutions, not only their civilization, but brought also their hatreds. At this moment, and for more than seventy years past, France and England have been at peace, and it is given to our generation to witness a spectacle which would have seemed almost improbable, not to say impossible, a few years before. We have seen France and England arrayed together against a common foe; and to us British subjects of French origin, British subjects who have learned to love England, who appreciate her benevolent rule, who would not go back to the allegiance of France, but who still ever cherish in our hearts the love of the land of our ancestors, no spectacle could be more consoling than to see

THE BANNERS OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND

waving together on the banks of the Alma, on the heights of Inkerman and amid the ashes of Sebastopol. Such is the case to-day. Such was not the case, however, at the time of the discovery of America, at the time of the establishment of English and French posts upon this continent. On the contrary, at that

time French and English had been arrayed for generations and centuries in deadly feuds. They brought over these feuds with them, they brought over with them the enmity which had divided them in Europe, and here on this continent they sought each other across lakes and rivers, mountains and forests, and endeavored to inflict upon each other all the injury they possibly could. They had before them the boundless space of this virgin continent, but they entered into a deadly war for the possession of the miserable huts which constituted their first establishments. Well, the long duel, as we know, was settled on the plains of Abraham. The war, however, was carried on for a year longer by the Chevalier de Lévis, and the continuation of the war had no material effect except to extract from the victor most generous terms of capitulation. These terms have been referred to, I need not refer to them again. The religious communities were granted all their possessions as freely as if they had remained under the domain of the French King. It was stated by the honorable member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) when he opened this debate, that the Terms of Capitulation had been modified by the Treaty of Paris. For my part I am not able to see the difference, but if difference there be, I am quite willing to admit the interpretation of it which was given by the British Government itself. Respecting the treatment by the British Government of those communities which were promised special immunity, I can see

NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEIR POSITION

under the French regime and their condition under the English regime. The British Government treated those communities and the whole population, for that matter, in religious concerns, with the greatest generosity. All the religious communities, with the single exception of the Jesuits, were maintained in possession of their estates. There was an exception made

of the Jesuits. What was the cause of it ? Was it by the right of conquest as asserted by the honorable member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)?

Mr. McCarthy :—Will the honorable gentleman excuse me ? I did not make that assertion. It was by the introduction of the law at the Conquest, not by virtue of the Conquest at all— the introduction of the English law whereby the estates became forfeited to the Crown.

Mr. Laurier :—So be it ; I accept the correction. I do not intend to discuss the legal aspects of the question, because, in my judgment, the legal aspect does not come here. But even if, as stated by the honorable gentleman, the British Government took possession of these estates by virtue of the introduction of the English law into this country, still that might have applied as well to the other communities as to the Jesuit estates. Why was that exception made? Why were these other religious communities maintained in possession of their estates, and the Jesuits excepted? I think that the Minister of Justice yesterday gave the real key of the difficulty when he stated that it was

THE COVETOUSNESS OF LORD AMHERST,

who, in 1770, obtained from the King an actual promise of the grant of those estates. Had it not been afterwards for the abolition of the order by the Pope, I firmly believe the Jesuits would have continued in the enjoyment of their estates in the same manner as the other religious communities. But the order was abolished, and after the last Jesuit had departed this life the British Government took possession of the estates. Then, as we know, the heirs of Lord Amhest claimed these estates in virtue of the promise which had been made in 1770 by the King. But the protests were so strong,not only from the old inhabitants, but from the new inhabitants as well, not only from the old subjects of the King, but from the new sub-

jects of the King, that the Government could not carry out its intentions of making a grant of these estates to the heirs of Lord Amherst. On the other hand, though the Government had taken possession of these estates, and though they were promised to General Amherst, the Government could not put them into the general fund, and they erected them into a special fund. But there is this to be remembered, whether the laws of England were introduced into the colony or not, whether the old laws continued to be in force or not, the old French laws continued to prevail in the country just as before. And there is this also to be remembered, that under the laws of Quebec as they existed under the French regime, property of the nature of the Jesuits' estates, when the order had been abolished, would have reverted to the Ordinary of the diocese, property of that kind would have gone to the Bishop of Quebec or to the Bishop of Montreal. Such was the contention of the church at that time, and from that day up to this, the ecclesiastical authorities of the Province of Quebec have never ceased to claim that property as rightly belonging to them. There has been a continuation of the protests from that moment to the present. Protests were made on these dates:

1. 4th February, 1793, by the citizens of Quebec.—2. 18th November, 1799, by His Grace Jean François Hubert, Bishop of Quebec.—3. About the year 1835, by His Grace Joseph Signay, Bishop of Quebec; His Grace Pierre Flavien Turgeon, Bishop of Sydimo, Coadjutor of Quebec; His Grace Jean Jacques Lartigue, Bishop of Telmosse, Grand Vicar of the district of Montreal.—4. January, 1845, by His Grace Joseph Signay, Archbishop of Quebec, and by the Bishops of Montreal, Kingston and Toronto.—5. June, 1847, by the clergy of the dioceses of Montreal and Quebec.—6. January, 1874, by the Rev. Father Theophile Charraux, Superior General of the Jesuits' Mission in Canada.—7. 9th October, 1878, by the Archbishop of Quebec and Bishops of Three Rivers, Rimouski, Montreal, Sherbrooke, Ottawa, St. Hyacinthe and Chiccutimi.—8. 2nd January, 1885, by the Archbishop of Quebec.

So you see that from the moment the British

Government took possession of these estates, the church authorities of the Province of Quebec

NEVER CEASED TO CLAIM THEM

as their own. Now, could that matter have remained in that condition? Could it be said in a Catholic country like the Province of Quebec, that such protests would remain unheeded? Time and again, as you are aware, the Government of Quebec attempted to dispose of these estates and to settle the question. Mr. Mercier is not the first man in office who attempted to deal with this question. Time and again his predecessors attempted to do the same thing. There was a reason for that. Those estates are valued to-day by Mr. Rivard, superintendent of the estates, at the sum of $1,200,000. They yield a revenue of only $22,000, less than 2 per cent. Some of the property is without any annual value. Take for instance the old college of the Jesuits in Quebec, right in the centre of the city, opposite the Basilica. That property to-day does not give one cent of revenue, on the contrary it is a burden upon the exchequer of the Province, whereas, were the property disposed of, it would sell to advantage. Time and time again, the Government of Quebec have attempted to dispose of it, but every time the Government placed it in the market, the religious authorities came forward and claimed the property as their own, and rendered the attempts at sale abortive. Was that forever to remain thus? The question was opened more than once. Mr. DeBoucherville, in 1876, endeavored to enter into negotiations to settle the case with the religious authorities of the Province. He did not succeed. It has been asserted many times in the press, though the fact has never been stated officially, that Mr. Chapleau, when in office, entered into negotiations with the religious authorities, and went so far as to offer $500,000 for the removal of the claims of the religious authorities on these estates. Of this I do

not know the exact truth. I can only speak from the rumors published in the press. But it is quite certain that Mr. Ross, who succeeded him as Premier a few years afterwards, entered into negotiations for the settlement of the estates. Nothing came of the negotiations, and why? Because it required some courage to deal with the question and to settle it, because it was certain that whoever dealt with it, would have to face much prejudice, as those events have proved.

MR. MERCIER HAD THE COURAGE

to grapple with this question and to settle it, and, if nothing else in the career of Mr. Mercier remained to stamp him as a statesman, there would be this, that he had the courage to deal with this question, and this would give him that title. The question, I think, had to be settled. In what manner was it settled? It was settled just in the manner which was most fair to all: it was settled by compromise. Mr. Mercier in effect said to the religious authorities: I hold these estates as the representative of the Crown; the right belongs to the province of Quebec; our title to them is legal; I do not admit that you have a legal title to them, while on the other hand you pretend you have a legal title. Be that as it may, he said, let us make a sacrifice each of our pretensions; I hold the property and the whole of the estates, and you claim the whole of them; let us compromise, and let us settle the question forever. Now, I ask every man in this House, no matter what his prejudice may be, I ask the honorable member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) himself, in whose fairness I have the greatest confidence, was there ever a more fair method adopted of disposing of a public question than that which was adopted in this case? Of course, it is quite easy for the editor in his easy chair, it is quite easy for the publisher in his office, it is quite easy for the clergyman in his study, to settle questions according to

fixed theories, but the public man in office or in Opposition cannot settle a question according to fixed theories, but he has to consult the wishes, not only the wishes, aye, but the passions and the prejudices of the people with whom he has to deal. And in a country like the province of Quebec where there are more than 1,000,000 of Catholic inhabitants, with a regularly constituted hierarchy, with such a claim as the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities could present, was it to be said that this question

SHOULD FOR EVER REMAIN OPEN

and these lands never be disposed of for the advantage of the exchequer of the Province? It seems to me that upon that question I can appeal again with confidence to the testimony of all those who will approach the question with an unbiassed mind. After all, Mr. Speaker, there is but one way which has been invented yet to govern men satisfactorily, and it is to govern them according to the wishes which are expressed by public opinion. I do not mean to say that public opinion is always right, that public opinion always comes up to the standard of eternal justice or truth; I do not mean to say that public opinion always comes up to the standard of wordly wisdom, but if you govern the people according to public opinion you are sure to have peace and harmony in the land and when this question was settled it was settled according to the wishes of the public opinion in the province of Quebec, and by so doing you have peace and harmony in the land. Now, if you are to attempt to override the well known wishes of the population of the province of Quebec, instead of harmony and peace, you will have probably discord, the consequences of which I would fear to look at. Such is the reason why this question has been settled in the manner in which it has been settled. But it has been insisted by the honorable member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and by some other honorable mem-

bers also, that this legislation was offensive from a Protestant point of view. Well, strange to say, the Protestant minority is represented in the Legislature of the province of Quebec. They have, if I remember rightly, some 12 members of the Protestant persuasion in the Provincial Legislature. When this question came to be discussed

TWO MEMBERS ONLY PROTESTED,

and they protested very mildly. And they protested against what? Only against one single feature of the act, against the fact that the name of His Holiness the Pope appeared in the preamble of the act. Mr. Mercier gave them at that moment the very answer quoted yesterday by the Minister of Justice, and he told them: If you do not want the name of the Pope in this matter, you will suggest the name of any one to put in his place. It was a compromise with the religious authorities of the province of Quebec, and I think Mr. Mercier acted fairly and prudently in dealing directly with the head of the Roman Catholic church. His arguments were so convincing that those objections were not pressed, the act passed unanimously, and Mr. Mercier was enabled to speak in the following terms of the attitude of his Protestant colleagues:—

> I thank the Protestant members for the moderation with which they have discussed this question. It is a good omen. The unanimity which now prevails is a proof that the different races of which our population is composed, have lived in peace and harmony and approach the most delicate questions with that spirit of conciliation which accomplishes wonders when it is properly directed.

Well, this legislation is not satisfactory to our Protestant friends, or to some of them at least from Ontario. Still if the Protestants of Quebec are satisfied, who can object? I understood that it was said a moment ago by the honorable member for Hunt-

ingdon (Mr. Scriver), that the Protestants of Quebec are not all satisfied. They may not all be satisfied, indeed. It is very seldom that upon any question that may come up men of the same creed, of the same race, will be entirely satisfied; but if anybody has a right to speak for the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec, are they not

THOSE WHO ARE ELECTED

by the people of that province to represent them in the Legislature, and if these do not choose to make any representation, if these on the contrary say that after all this question has been settled and approved, no one else has the right to complain. But the honorable member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), it appears, has no confidence in those who represent his fellow countrymen in the province of Quebec. If I am to believe what he said yesterday, he has but a poor opinion of those who have been entrusted by his fellow religionists in the province to take charge of their interests in the Legislature. These were his words yesterday:

> Does this look as if the Protestants of the province of Quebec were desirous, and willing, and anxious that this legislation should remain unchanged, or does it not look as if, were the Protestant minority in that province given reasonable encouragement, they would get justice—and no more than justice are they entitled to, and no more than justice I hope they will ever ask for—from the Parliament of this country. Then they will be up and doing, to get their share of the legislation, but in the Legislature of that province, composed as it is now, they cannot expect it. There was no Protestant representative in the Cabinet of that province until recently, and, when one was chosen, he had to be elected in spite of the vote of the Protestant minority.

Now, without going any further, I wish to take issue upon this point with the honorable gentleman from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when he says

bers also, that this legislation was offensive from a Protestant point of view. Well, strange to say, the Protestant minority is represented in the Legislature of the province of Quebec. They have, if I remember rightly, some 12 members of the Protestant persuasion in the Provincial Legislature. When this question came to be discussed

TWO MEMBERS ONLY PROTESTED,

and they protested very mildly. And they protested against what? Only against one single feature of the act, against the fact that the name of His Holiness the Pope appeared in the preamble of the act. Mr. Mercier gave them at that moment the very answer quoted yesterday by the Minister of Justice, and he told them: If you do not want the name of the Pope in this matter, you will suggest the name of any one to put in his place. It was a compromise with the religious authorities of the province of Quebec, and I think Mr. Mercier acted fairly and prudently in dealing directly with the head of the Roman Catholic church. His arguments were so convincing that those objections were not pressed, the act passed unanimously, and Mr. Mercier was enabled to speak in the following terms of the attitude of his Protestant colleagues:—

> I thank the Protestant members for the moderation with which they have discussed this question. It is a good omen. The unanimity which now prevails is a proof that the different races of which our population is composed, have lived in peace and harmony and approach the most delicate questions with that spirit of conciliation which accomplishes wonders when it is properly directed.

Well, this legislation is not satisfactory to our Protestant friends, or to some of them at least from Ontario. Still if the Protestants of Quebec are satisfied, who can object? I understood that it was said a moment ago by the honorable member for Hunt-

are men of merit, men of ability, and some of the greatest ability. But, Mr. Speaker, if that is the opinion which the honorable gentleman entertains of his own countrymen and co-religionists in the province of Quebec; if he believes that they are not able to take care of their own interests, but that the Protestants of other provinces must come to their rescue, perhaps he would be interested to know what is the opinion which is entertained by some of the Protestants of Quebec of those too zealous Protestants of the province of Ontario who want to take up the cudgels on their behalf. I hold in my hand an extract from a paper published in the Eastern Townships, the Waterloo *Advertiser*, edited by a disciple and a lifelong friend of the late Mr. Huntington, as good and as strong a Protestant as ever lived. This is how the paper speaks:

Every patriotic Canadian must deplore he intemperate discussion that has been provoked by the Jesuits' Bill. The measure has become law, and no amount of controversy can alter the fact. It is altogether the domestic concern of the province of Quebec, and any outside interference is simply meddlesome and impertinent. The parsons and the Orangemen of Ontario have joined hands to make war on the Catholics of Quebec. The Legislature has settled the old dispute over the Jesuits' estates in a manner satisfactory to the people. A source of irritation and discontent has been removed once for all. The Jesuits' Bill passed the Legislature, practically, without a dissenting voice. The chosen representatives ef the Protestant minority accepted it as a fair settlement of a vexed question. The basis of settlement called for an expenditure of public funds, and to obviate any possibility of jealousy on the part of the Protestant minority proportionate sum was at the same time voted for the Protestant education. That was fair and just and it was so understood by the minority. The Protestant minority in this province is quite able to take care of itself. In the purely domestic concerns of the province, it asks no assistance and expects no sympathy from outsiders. Taking it all in all, the minority has been fairly treated by the majority. There may have been friction at times, but there has not been in the history of the province an instance in which the powers of the majority have been used to crush or injure the minority.

If the Catholics and Protestants are able to get along together peaceably, why should Ontario interfere? The Protestant minority as a whole has not and does not complain of the Jesuit settlement. It is recognized by broad-minded and patriotic men as being the best thing that could have been done under the circumstances.

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the opinion entertained in the Eastern Townships at least by one section of the people. Now, my honorable friend from Huntingdon (Mr Scriver) a moment ago referred to the

TREATMENT OF THE MINORITY

in the province of Quebec. I have the greatest respect, as my friend knows, for everything which he utters, and I am sure he will agree with me in one thing—if the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec have anything to complain of—and I listened to what might be called the list of grievances which we heard read to-day by the honorable member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—but if the Protestant minority have anything to complain of, I ask: Are they not themselves responsible for it? In all that list of grievances which were read, is there an act of legislation against which they have ever protested? Have they not always supported the Conservative party which has always been in power, and has not every one of these items in the list which we have heard recited as grievances, been passed by the Conservative party which the Protestants of Quebec always support? Sir, I have simply to say this, speaking as a Canadian of French origin, that if my fellow-countrymen of British origin have any grievances, real or imaginary, let them come before the Legislature of Quebec; and although I have not a seat in that Legislature I can claim that I have some influence there; nay, I do not want any influence, I know that the majority of the members in that House, the Conservative minority as well, would be ever ready to give them what remedial legislation they may think for their benefit. But up to

a few days ago, I never heard that the Protestant minority

HAD ANYTHING TO COMPLAIN OF

in the treatment which they have received from the majority of the province of Quebec, and if they had any serious grievances, can it be told upon the floor of this Parliament that these grievances would not have been ventilated before the representatives of the people? I repeat what I said a moment ago. It is quite easy for the editor in his chair, or the clergyman in his study, or for any party who has no responsibility to the public at large—it is quite easy for them to determine questions by fixed theories, but it is another thing to fix them according to the will of the people, and I do not admit that there is any serious grievance so long as those grievances are not ventilated upon the floor of the House of the Provincial Parliament. The honorable member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) also said something yesterday about Mr. Joly. He claimed that Mr. Joly had been ousted from public life. I do not know by whom, but I suppose he meant by the Liberal party.

Mr. McCarthy:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Laurier:—The honorable member says: "hear, hear." Mr. Joly had been in power for some eighteen months and he was ousted from power by the most dishonest warfare which ever public man had to suffer in this country. Mr Joly was ousted from power largely by a violation of the constitution, perpetrated by this Parliament, and in which the honorable member for Simcoe was himself instrumental. If Mr. Joly had had anything like fair play, I believe that to this day he would have been in power in the province of Quebec. Mr. Joly never had anything to suffer at the hands of the Liberal party; on the contrary, Mr. Joly is a man for whom we have the greatest respect. We have differed from him upon one question, and one question only, the question which arose out of

the rebellion in the North-West. Upon that question Mr. Joly took one course, and we took a different course. I am not to argue this question over again, but I have simply to say this to the honorable member for Simcoe, that in the last election which took place in Megantic, where a Protestant representative of the Cabinet of Mr. Mercier was before the people, and when this very question was to be tested at the polls, Mr. Joly came down

AND SUPPORTED THE CANDIDATE

and the policy of the Government. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, from the discussion which we have had in this Parliament since yesterday, that though the Act is objectionable to some people—and I find no fault with the honorable member for Muskoka, I find no fault with my honorable friend for Simcoe, for holding the views they hold—I would not attribute to them other than the motive of conscience, that they are doing what they think for the best, they are representing what they deem to be in the interest of the people at large—but it is manifest to me that their judgment has been considerably biassed by the fact that the name of the Jesuits has been introduced in that legislation. It seems to me manifest that the appearance of that name has evoked a fresh outburst of hostility which that celebrated order has been subjected to in many lands and in many ages. Now, it is said that they are dangerous men. Suppose all that has been said were true, would that be any reason to refuse them the justice to which they are entitled? Suppose they were dangerous men, as it is represented they are; that might perhaps be a reason to refuse them civil rights, to refuse them recognition. But they were incorporated by the province of Quebec two years ago, and the act which incorporated them received the approval of one of those weak Protestants, according to the member for Simcoe, who represent the minority in the Legislature of Quebec. Mr.

Lynch, a fellow Conservative of the honorable member for Simcoe, speaking on that occasion, used this remarkable language:—

Mr. Lynch, on the bill to incorporate the Jesuits, said that, notwithstanding what might be thought in some quarters, there was uothing in the bill alarming in its character. We were living in an age when wisdom prevailed, living in an age when freedom was supposed to exist the world over, and nowhere in the Dominion of Her Majesty did liberty prevail more than in the province of Quebec. In committee, with a consideration of fairness which characterized members of the House, certain portions of the preamble were struck out. Now is it possible that the intelligent public opinion of the province of Quebec should deny those Jesuit Fathers the civil rights which we have granted to everyone else? If there is any religious aspect to this question, it should be settled elsewhere than in this House. If there is anything in this bill against civil rights, let us strike it out. Until this is shown, I am prepared to support this bill.

And supported the bill was, and it became law. Under such circumstances, it seems to me that the explosion of bitterness which we have seen to-day and yesterday ·

COMES RATHER TARDILY.

But, Sir, any man, be he friend or foe of the Jesuit Order, must at least give them credit for this, that they repel and deny all the charges which are made against them; they repel and deny the dangerous doctrines which are attributed to them. Now, I would not enter upon that question for one moment were it not for the remarks which fell to-day from my friend the honorable member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); but I cannot allow such views as those which have been expressed to pass without some comment, though this is not the proper sphere or time either to defend or attack the Jesuits. Every one familiar with French literature knows that Pascal, in his celebrated "Lettres Provinciales," has quoted several para-

graphs, which he attributes to the Jesuits, of very objectionable character. I have not been able for my part to discover those extracts; I have often sought for the text books; but could not find them, and I cannot say whether they are right or wrong. But I know this, that writers of as great eminence as Pascal have asserted over and over again that all the statements upon which Pascal based his accusations have been refuted, time and again, by members of the Jesuit Order. Now, the Jesuits, it is admitted, are a body of able men, and, it must be admitted also, are a body of pure men, and they are characterized by knowledge and high attainments; but they are men, they are fallible, and it would be strange indeed if in such a numerous order some were not found to write objectionable things. But suppose one of an order were found to write objectionable things would it follow that the whole order ought to be held responsible, as was said by one member? So are you to conclude that, because one of the order happens to write objectionable things, the whole order are to be condemned? It would be just as if you were to condemn all the Protestant divines of Ontario because the Rev. Dr. Wild said, a few days ago, that to kill a Jesuit was no crime. I will not, Mr. Speaker, push this controversy any further. This is not the place, I say, to attack the Jesuits, nor the place to defend them. The place to attack the Jesuits, in so far as this bill is concerned, was the Legislature of Quebec; but, whether a man be a friend or a foe of the Jesuits, it seems to me that their history in Canada, whatever it may have been in other lands, has been such as to command not only admiration, but the greatest admiration. They have been

THE PIONEERS OF THIS COUNTRY.

In the language of a great historian, not a cape was turned, not a river was entered, but a Jesuit led the way. Every inch of the soil of Ontario was trodden

by their weary feet at least 150 years before there was an English settler in that province. Nay, the very soil of the province has been consecrated by their blood, shed in their attempts to win over souls to the God of Protestants and Catholics alike. Of the Jesuits I have nothing more to say. The question, as I say, is not one fit for this audience; if it is to be discussed it should be discussed elsewhere than here. But the resolution asserts that they have been expelled. The honorable member for Simcoe stated yesterday that they have been expelled from several countries; and the honorable member for North Norfolk stated to-day that they have been expelled from twenty different countries. Sir, this is true; but, what is equally true, they have never yet been expelled from a free country. They have been expelled from countries where true principles of human freedom, such as we understand them in British countries, were not understood. The honorable gentleman told us yesterday that they had been expelled from Germany in 1872. Why is it, in a British Assembly, that the example of Germany will be given to us to imitate? Does the honorable gentleman hold that because the Jesuits have been expelled from Germany—Germany ruled by a man of genius, but a despot after all—such an example should be followed here? We have been told that the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1880. Yes, they were; and to the shame of the French republic be it said. But

THEY ARE NOT THE ONLY MEN

who were expelled by that Government. In 1880 six or seven different religious communities were expelled. Sisters of Charity were expelled—angels on earth, if there are any, women who renounce everything that life can give in order to give their life up to the daily maintenance and succor of those who are poor, helpless and suffering. Not only those religious communities, but the princes of the House

of Orleans were also expelled from France—men who were the *élite* of France, men of whom more than forty years ago, Prince Metternich said, when they were in their boyhood: "They are young men such as there are few and princes such as there are none." The Duc d'Aumale, one of them, was expelled, one of the noblest soldiers of the French army, a man whose soul is so high that the only manner in which he requited the cruel treatment meted out to him was to make a gift to the ungrateful nation of the Chateau de Chantilly with all its art treasures. I have only this to say to an honorable gentleman who brings such arguments as these: I feel ten thousand times prouder of my native land, which can deal justly and generously with the Jesuits, than of the land of my ancestors, which, though a republic, is to-day so retrogade in its constitution and practice of freedom, that it banishes those who do not come up to the standard of its own citizenship. In this matter, I am reminded that the honorable gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) yesterday stated that we of French origin sometimes forget that this is a British country. I have his words here and I want to quote them:

> We must never forget, said he, I am afraid that some of my friends from the Province of Quebec do sometimes forget that this is a British country, that by the fortunes of war that event was decided, and the greater half of this continent passed over to the British Crown.

What did the honorable gentleman mean by that? I wish he had said a little more or a little less. I wish he had not contented himself with making an insinuation, but that, if he had a charge to make, he should have had the pluck and the courage to make it. I tell this to the honorable gentleman. I am of French origin and I am proud of my origin, and I know my fellow countrymen of Anglo Saxon race too well not to be aware that if I had not the pride of my origin in my heart they would never think of me but with the contempt which I should deserve. I am of French origin, but

I AM A BRITISH SUBJECT.

The honorable member for North Norfolk (Mr.Charlton) said, a moment ago,that there should be but one race here.

Mr. McCarthy :—Hear, hear !

Mr. Laurier :—The honorable gentleman says "hear, hear." Well, what would that race be ? Is it the British lion that is to swallow the French lamb,or the French lamb that is to swallow the British lion ? There can be more than one race, but there shall be but one nation. Scotland has not forgotten her origin, as far as I know, but Scotland is British. I do not intend to forget my origin, but I am a Canadian before everything.Let me state this further to my honorable friend, I have the pride of my origin ; I feel the strengthof the blood which flows in my veins, but, in the language of the Latin poet, I say :

Homo sum ; humani nihil a me alienum puto.

" I am a man ; nothing that relates to man is foreign to my sympathy ;" but, at the same time, though I would never forget the language of my race, the language which my mother taught me, I say to the honorable gentleman that if I had my choice to return to French allegiance, never would I consent to do so. I do not speak only my own feelings when I thus speak, but I voice the feelings of every one of my countrymen. I do not give utterance merely to the feelings of those who sit beside me, but I am sure I speak the feelings of those French Canadians who sit on the other side as well, when I say that if to-day a poll was taken in the province of Quebec, or all through the Dominion of Canada, giving a choice between allegiance to England or allegiance to France, there would not be one single vote cast in favor of a return to the allegiance to France. We would remain British subjects ; but because we are British subjects, is it to be expected that we shall turn

TRAITORS TO OUR ORIGIN,

traitors to everything that makes life valuable? What would be life if a man had not in his veins and in his heart a feeling for the blood of his own country? The honorable gentleman told us yesterday that he was an Irishman. Would he deny the land of his ancestors? Well, I would pity him from my heart if he would. But, after all, if ever we were to forget that we are of French origin, I am sure we could not forget it in view of the agitation which is now going on in the province of Ontario, because from day to day, from week to week, in a certain press, we have been appealed to—we of French origin—as Liberals of French origin—to vote for disallowance against the Jesuits' Act. From day to day in a certain press, the Liberals of the province of Quebec have been appealed to vote against the Government on this question; and in my hand I hold one of the last issues, in which after having recited all the villanies of which the Jesuits are accused, the editor continues as follows:—

It is safe to say, therefore, that if the Liberals of England or of France were in the position of Mr. Laurier and his followers they would not hesitate a moment in killing this conspiracy in Quebec. Even if they did not hold the Act to be absolutely unconstitutional they would certainly vote for its disallowance as being contrary to the public interest.

Well, as far as reference is made to the Liberals of France, I have no doubt the editor is quite correct. No doubt, if the Liberals of France had the power to vote on this question, they would certainly disallow this Act; but I have this to say, that I am not and we are not Liberals of the French school. I have not said it once but ten times and twenty times in my own province, that I am

A LIBERAL OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOL,

that I and my friends have nothing in common with

the Liberals of France. A short time ago, I was sorry to hear my honorable friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) express regret that there was no Protestant party, as far as I understood him. There are men of my own race, who entertain the same view as the honorable gentleman, and would desire to have a Catholic party. I have always raised my voice against that doctrine, and, as far back as 1877, speaking to a French audience in the French language in the city which I have the honor to represent now, the good old city of Quebec, I used to those who, like my honorable friend, would separate men upon the ground of creed, this language:

> You wish to organize all the Catholics in one party, without any other tie, without any other basis than the community of religion, but have you not reflected that, by that very fact, you will organize the Protestant population as one party, and that then, instead of the peace and harmony which exist to-day between the different elements of the Canadian population, you would bring on war, religious war, the most disastrous of all wars ?

Those were my sentiments ten years ago; those are my sentiments to-day. My honorable friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that we should not allow this Act because the Jesuits are inimical to liberty. Such a statement would not surprise me in the mouth of a Liberal from France, but it does surprise me to hear it on the floor of this Parliament. Are we to be told that, because men are inimical to liberty, they shall not be given liberty? In our own doctrine and in our own view, liberty shines not only for the friends of liberty, but also for the enemies of liberty. We make no difference whatever: and, as far as the Liberals of England are concerned, I am sure of one thing, that, if they were here, they would never vote as the editor of the *Mail* supposes they would. The Liberals of England have been for the last century and more

THE CHAMPIONS OF FREEDOM

all over the world, and, if we have freedom to-day, as we understand it in this country and in this age, it is largely due to the efforts of the Liberal party in England. They understood long ago that liberty is not only for the friends of liberty, but for all. They understood long ago that the security of the State depends entirely upon the utmost freedom being given to all opinions, that no one is to be canvassed for his opinion, right or wrong, but that the utmost freedom shall be given to all opinions, and that the popular judgment will decide between the grain and the chaff, will select the one and reject the other. That is the principle which I have, in my humble way, endeavored to inculcate for many years amongst my fellow-countrymen of French origin. That, with a steadfast adherence to the broadest principles of constitutional freedom, is the guiding star which, in the station I now occupy and in any station I may have in life, I shall ever endeavor to follow.

THE 24th JUNE, 1889

NATIONAL FESTIVAL OF THE FRENCH CANADIANS

MR. LAURIER'S REFLECTIONS ON THE ROLE OF THE RACE IN AMERICA

In June, 1889, 25,000 French Canadians, from all parts of the continent, assembled at Quebec around a monument raised by their subcriptions to the memory of Jacques Cartier, the discoverer, and of De Brebœuf, one of the first missionaries, of Canada. The festivities lasted during three days and were marked by great splendor. One of the addresses delivered on the occasion and which produced the most effect was beyond question Mr. Laurier's reply to the toast of "Canada" at the patriotic banquet of the 24th June at the Jacques Cartier Hall, in the French quarter of St Roch's, which he represents in the Commons. It was as fellows:

MR. PRESIDENT,

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I have often thought, and the idea has been impressed on me more than ever by the brilliancy of this day's festivities, that there should be only one celebration of the St Jean Baptiste in this country and that that celebration should take place in the good old city of Quebec: I have often thought and I now think more than ever that Quebec should be for French Canadians what Mecca is for Arabia, the city *par excellence*, the holy city among all.

It may be said, perhaps, that I am partial

towards Quebec, but to this my simple answer is that I have many reasons for being so and that, far from being ashamed of the fact, I glory in it.

For, it must be conceded, there is only one Quebec. Our Montreal friends, who are with us tonight and who are with good reason proud of their own city will, perhaps, protest; but I do not allow their protests. This continent swarms with cities like Montreal, and I call to witness our friends here present from the United States. I am far from wishing to say anything disparaging of Montreal, but there is only one Quebec. Cities like Montreal, with wide, straight, regular streets, are, as an Irishman would say, to be found at every door. These things have their value, certainly, but I repeat that there is only one Quebec. What constitutes the great charm of Quebec is its variety, the unexpectedness of its aspects; at each step you make, the scene changes and a new panorama as ravishing as the previous one, but of a different style, unrolls itself to your sight. This charm of Quebec every one can enjoy: strangers enjoy it as well, and, perhaps, more than we do, because men are so constituted that they do not know how to sufficiently appreciate what they have themselves.

But Quebec possesses another charm, which can be enjoyed in all its plenitude only by us, French Canadians; it is the charm of memories. Men of Quebec, you are privileged beings. Antiquity has preserved for us the memory of a famous epitaph, calling on the passer-by to stop, as he was treading on the ashes of a hero, but you, men of Quebec, you breathe, live and have your being among the dust of heroes.

At each step you make in your city, a monument, a building, a stone, a glimpse of the sky at the end of a narrow street calls to mind a whole world of heroic events. To-day, you have raised another monument, which will forever perpetuate the memory of the cross planted by the envoy of the king of France,

when he took possession of this country in the name of his royal master.

This country, however, has not remained French soil. Still we have remained true to the memory of our old mother country.

Although separated from France for over a century and differing from her at present in several ways, we have always worshipped her in our hearts, watching from afar, but with ceaseless interest, all the ivicissitudes of her agitated career and sharing in her joys and triumphs, as well as in her disasters and sorrows, still more, indeed, in her sorrows than in her joys.

Adversity is the test of affection and I appeal to you all if it is not true that we never realized how dear France was to us as we realized it during the period of her reverses, during the fatal years of 1870 and 1871, when the telegraph brought us the news of defeat instead of the victories which we had looked for. And when there was no longer room for doubt, when, having hoped against hope, we had, in order to convince ourselves, to read over and over again the text of the harsh law imposed by the conqueror and when Alsace and Loraine were violently severed from French territory, I ask you, if we had been deprived of one of our own limbs could we have suffered keener anguish?

The toast proposed by Mr. Langelier reminds us that our separation from France has imposed new duties upon us has created new interests and opened new affections to us. We are French Canadians, but our country is not confined to the territory overshadowed by the citadel of Quebec; our country is Canada, it is the whole of what is covered by the British flag on the American continent, the fertile lands bordered by the Bay of Fundy, the Valley of the St. Lawrence, the region of the great lakes, the prairies of the West, the Rocky Mountains, the lands washed by the famous ocean where breezes are said to

be as sweet as the breezes of the Mediterranean. Our fellow-countrymen are not only those in whose veins runs the blood of France. They are all those, whatever their race or whatever their language, whom the fortune of war, the chances of fate, or their own choice have brought among us, and who acknowledge the sovereignty of the British Crown. As far as I am concerned, loudly do I proclaim it, those are my follow-countrymen. I am a Canadian. But I told it elsewhere, and with greater pleasure, I repeat here this evening, among all my fellow-countrymen, the first place in my heart is for those in whose veins runs the blood of my own veins. Yet I do not hesitate to say that the rights of my follow-countrymen of different origins are as dear to me, as sacred to me, as the rights of my own race, and if it unfortunately happened that they ever were attacked, I would defend them with just as much energy and vigor as the rights of my own race. I say I: should I not say you, we all of us? Yes, we are too much the sons of France, of that generous nation which has so often shed her blood for the defence of the weak, of the oppressed, not to be ever ready to defend the rights of our fellow-countrymen of different nationalities to the same extent as our own. What I claim for us in an equal share of sun of justice, of liberty; that share we have it; we have it ample, and what we claim for ourselves we are anxious to grant to others. I do not want French Canadians to domineer over any one, nor any one to domineer over them. Equal justice. Equal rights. It is written that the sands of seas are numbered. It is written that not an hair falls from one's head without the permission of an Eternal Providence, eternally wise. Can we not believe that in that supreme battle here, on the Plains of Abraham, when the fate of arms turned against us, can we not believe that it entered into the decrees of Providence that the two races, up to that time enemies, should henceforth live in peace and harmony, and henceforth should form one nation? Such was the inspiring cause of Confederation.

When the British provinces were united under the same constitution, the hope now acknowledged was to give to all the scattered elements therein a national ideal, to present to the world the spectacle of a nation diverse in its origins and retaining in all its groups the respect for family and race traditions, but giving thenceforward to all one and the same aspiration. I have not forgotten that, at its inception, Confederation was not accepted without fear by number of Canadians of French origin, but there is nevertheless one thing for which the French Canadians are entitled to universal admiration. The fault of democracies is usually to flatter the mob. I do not know how to flatter and I shall never stoop to play the part of the flatterer, either to crowds or to individuals; but it is an act of simple justice to note the admirable pliability with which the French Canadians have adapted themselves to the different regimes through which they have passed, the constitution of 1775, that of 1791, that of 1841 and lastly that of Confederation. I am not ignorant of the fact that there can be no nation without a national pride, nor am I unaware that in almost all cases national pride is inspired by those tragic events which bring suffering and tears in their train, but which at the same time call out all the forces of a nation or of a race, and on this head it has been correctly said that the happiest people are those without a history. Our history under Confederation presents none of the dramatic facts, which make us so attached to the past; it has been calm and consequently happy. But peace has also its glories and its heroes. Canada under Confederation has produced men of whom any nation might justly feel proud. I will not speak of the Canadians of French origin, as Mr. Langelier referred to them a moment ago, but I will allude to the Canadians of British origin and mention two as examples. The first name I shall recall is that of a man from whom I differ *toto coelo*, but I am too much a French Canadian not to glory at all times in doing justice to an adver-

sary. I refer to Sir John A. Macdonald. I will not astonish my friend, Mr. Chapais, whom I see amongst us, if I state that I do not share Sir John Macdonald's political opinions, I may even add that I condemn almost all of them, but it must be acknowledged that, in his long career, Sir John Macdonald has displayed such eminent qualities that he would have made his mark on any of the world's stages and that, with the single exception, perhaps, of Mr. Mercier, no one on this continent has excelled as he has in the art of governing men.

The other name is that of a man who has been to me not only a friend, but more than a friend. I mean Honorable Edward Blake. Some years ago, speaking here of Mr. Blake, I declared that, in my opinion, America, at that moment, did not possess his equal and Europe could not show his superior.

That opinion has been confirmed by all that I have since seen of Mr. Blake. I have enjoyed the advantage of very close relations with him and have learned that his heart, soul, and character are in keeping with his splendid intellect. Besides these, many other names, the names of men of the highest eminence, occur to me; but I shall pass over them in silence in order to remind you of an event, which sums up in itself all that I could say and which will show you that, while remaining French Canadians, we are Canadians in the broadest acceptance of the term. Only a few weeks have elapsed since St. Sauveur was destroyed by fire. On that occasion, a man came forward to fight the scourge and check the spread of the conflagration.

With all the smartness, zeal and intrepidity of the true soldier, he rushed into the thick of the danger and found his death there. On the following day, the whole French population of Quebec filled the streets as they filled them to-day, but, instead of a feeling of joyfulness, the feeling in their hearts was one of deepest grief for the gallant Major Short, whose mutilated remains they had congregated to reverently salute on their way to the grave.

Major Short did not belong to our race; but he was our fellow countryman; and I would ask which one of you, French Canadians, in the midst of the still smoking ruins of your city and the presence of the dead hero, did not feel proud of being a Canadian?

Gentlemen, let us have the pride of our race! Let us be just to all our fellow countrymen, without distinction of race or creed! Let us know how to be not alone just, but generous, and let all our actions in the Confederation be characterized by that generosity which has marked the career of France in Europe!

A MESSAGE OF PEACE

THE RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SITUATION

TRACED BY A MASTER HAND

It may not be amiss to briefly recall the circumstances under which the following speech was delivered. The animosity and the fires of national and religious hatred, aroused and kept alive by certain fanatics, had reached their height, and the slightest incident might have precipitated a general conflagration. Who was going to try to allay the storm? Certainly, it was not Mr. McCarthy, the leader of the agitation, who would have dreamt of appearing in the province of Quebec to advocate his hate-breathing views. On the other hand, who was the French Canadian orator, who would have the courage to beard the agitator on his own ground? Mr. Laurier's name was mentioned, it is true, but it was said: he will not go. However, the Liberal leader did go and it may be said that he conquered, for his words had a notably appeasing effect. Not only did they crush prejudice on the spot, but, with the rapidity of electricity, they carried thousands of leagues away a clear perception of a situation, with regard to which only a very confused and erroneous idea had until then prevailed abroad. This speech alone won for Mr. Laurier the honor of being compared to the foremost statesmen of the mother-country by the *Canadian Gazette*, a journal which certainly had nothing in common with him. A few days afterwards, on the 17th of October, the cable brought us the following passage from the Tory paper's article:

"Mr. Laurier's Toronto speech places him at one bound in the front rank of British statesmen. To the eloquence native to the French Canadian, Mr. Laurier's adds honesty, directness of purpose and pure-minded patriotism, which mark him out as a leader. Men of such high mental and moral power were never more needed in the forefront of affairs in Canada than now."

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HONORABLE WILFRID LAURIER, AT TORONTO, ON THE 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1889

AT A MEETING CALLED BY THE YOUNG MEN'S LIBERAL CLUB

M. CHAIRMAN,

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I would be only too glad to be able to accept without any restriction the too kind things which you, Mr. Chairman, have been pleased to speak of me on this occasion; but upon this occasion—though on no other—I have to be a restrictionist. I cannot accept the too generous compliments which your kindness to me has prompted you to speak. You have alluded to the fact that when I last stood before an audience in this great city of Toronto I did not then occupy the position which the too great partiality of my friends in the House of Commons has imposed upon me. I can tell you, gentlemen, if there is anybody who regrets to-day that I have to appear before you in that position, no one regrets it more sincerely than I do. It would have been my pleasure—indeed, my too great pleasure—to be able to serve, as I have done many a day, under the leadership

OF MY ABLE AND DEAR FRIEND, MR. BLAKE.

Fate, however, decreed otherwise, and I thought that duty compelled me then to accept the position which, unfortunately, disease forced him to forego; and, in the discharge of the great responsibilities which I then assumed, I claim no other credit, but this which I do claim, that I have endeavored to discharge them to the best of my judgment, to the best of my conscience, without fear, without favor for any man.

And it is in this same spirit that I come before you this evening, and I say at once that I would not respond to the task which I have imposed upon myself, nor respond to the duty which you, Sir, and the Young Liberals of Ontario have entrusted me with, if I did not at once make the statement, as the very basis of everything that I shall feel obliged to say this evening, that the situation of our country at this moment, for causes obvious to all, is such that it cannot be viewed without some degree of anxiety and alarm. In the first place the most sanguine amongst us, viewing the perpetual stream of emigration which depletes our incipient and only incipient population, must admit, whether the admission comes manfully to his lips, or whether the admission remains within the dark recesses of conscience, that the economic position of the country is not satisfactory. Not that the country is wanting in wealth, in vigor, in energy. On the contrary,

WEALTH, VIGOR AND ENERGY

are everywhere exuberant, but in an evil hour the country allowed its limbs to be shackled and manacled by vicious fiscal lines under which its growth has been stunted. But the situation is not yet hopeless. Yet there are other considerations, there are other dangers which must be met, and which if not met may threaten the very existence of Confederation, and which can be met only, in my judgment, by a firm and judicious adherence to those principles which you, Mr. Chairman, acknowledge as Liberal principles. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not ignorant that in this province the Liberal party is at this moment subjected to many reproaches and strictures. In fact the dangers and the obstacles with which the Liberal party has to contend at this moment come not from its avowed opponents, but come from this new school of Liberals, who would import into the country Liberal principles from Germany, from France and Conti

nental Europe, altogether unsuited to the position we occupy on this continent. These men tell you that the Liberal party of to-day is composed of effete Liberals, weak Liberals, Liberals only in name. They tell you we have sacrificed the principles of the great Reform party for the support of a dominant Church. They tell you that upon a late occasion, upon a most important question, we went back upon every tradition, on every principle, of the great Liberal party. Well, Mr. Chairman, if these reproaches were to come from the ranks of the Conservative party, if these reproaches were to come openly from the friends of the Conservative party, as they are made in fact and in reality

ON BEHALF OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY,

I would pass them by; but, as they come from the so-called advanced Liberals and are addressed to the Liberal party, they cannot be ignored; and I am here to show, or to attempt to show, and I am sure I can show you that the men who use this language are not loyal to the principles they profess, and are not supporters of the party they pretend to serve. I call upon the Liberals not to be moved from the paths of duty by such reproaches addressed to them. I call upon all Liberals, those who agree with us and those who disagree with us, to be true to themselves and to their country on this great question. Let us remember that there is for every question that comes up a common ground not always easily discernible, but which will, when found, be found compatible with our interest and at the same time affording a sure solution upon the broadest national lines. Let us remember that when this ground is found it must be adhered to unflinchingly, and that upon every occasion and for every question, whether our course is approved or whether our course is censured, we must always and ever remain the same—bold without temerity and prudent without timidity! Again, Mr.

Chairman, I say that the situation of this country at this moment is full of difficulties

AND FULL OF PERILS.

We have now been under Confederation for the space of some twenty-two years, and the great task we set ourselves twenty-two years ago of building up a nation in Canada seems to be no more advanced than it was twenty-two years ago. New complications arise constantly, which make the hope indulged in twenty-two years ago almost as far away as it was at that time. And now, my fellow-countrymen, I ask you this—What are the causes of these complications; what are the causes of these difficulties and perils? Look for them, examine them, sift them well, and you will agree with me that all these causes, whatever shape they may assume, whatever mischief they may work, can all be summed up in this one word —distrust. Distrust of race against race, distrust of creed against creed, distrust of motives, distrust of intentions which combines a creed or a race within itself instead of moving them forward together all to a common end; distrust which engenders hostility, the consequences of which are almost appalling. I am now speaking in the province of Ontario. Is it not a fact that to-day, in this great province of Ontario, there is a latent or expressed

FEELING OF DISTRUST

of the Catholic province of Quebec? I come from the province of Quebec, and I know it unfortunately for a fact that in the Catholic province of Quebec there is a feeling of distrust of the Protestant province of Ontario. Now, for that state of things, for that universal distrust, that general feeling of diffidence which permeates the whole political body, I lay the charge and the blame upon the Conservative party. They have governed this country almost without interrup-

tion since Confederation. And when in power they have governed, and when out of power they have sought to govern, not by a broad, uniform, general policy which would have welded together all the provinces of Confederation, and which would have made every man proud of his citizenship as a Canadian; their object has been to obtain in every province a majority by appealing to the local prejudices of that province. In the province of Quebec by appealing to the prejudices of my fellow-Catholics, in the province of Ontario by appealing to the prejudices of extreme Protestants. That game was for a long time successful. It was sure to be successful as long as the conflicting passions of Ontario and Quebec could be kept active. But, Sir, no one can deal with impunity with

SUCH INFLAMMABLE MATERIAL

as religious and national passions. And I call you to witness, every one of you, that, on the day when the conflict of passion of Catholic Quebec and Protestant Ontario came, the whole fabric of Confederation trembled under the shock. And to-day, Mr. Chairman, to-day it is no rare occurence to hear repeated that fatal sentence spoken some years ago by a Conservative organ, threatening that if things did not go as it wished it would smash Confederation into its original fragments. This is the position, and in the face of this position what is the duty of the Liberal party? The duty of the Liberal party is plain. It is a duty upon which I appeal with great confidence to the young men of the whole Confederation. In the face of this universal distrust, the duty of the Liberal party is to promote, or rather to continue, the policy of hope and exertion for mutual respect and confidence. In the face of disintegration, if disintegration be simply hinted at, it is the duty of the Liberal party to stand firm by the principle of Confederation. I do not believe certainly that Confederation is

THE LAST WORD OF CANADA'S DESTINY.

It can be looked at simply as a transient state ; but, whenever the change comes, the change must be a step forward and not a step backward. We live under Confederation, and it is our duty to stand by Confederation, to be loyal to Confederation. I am a Liberal and I believe in movement, in progress ; but I do not believe in inconsiderate changes. I believe in changes rendered necessary by the natural evolution of the people's life. Still less would I be of those who clamor for a constitutional change, because the state of things that now exists comes into conflict with their personal prejudices and opinions. In the province to which I belong, our leaders at the time of Confederation had not absolute confidence in the scheme. Not that they thought it destroyed the federative principle ; it strengthened it. But they thought it was premature. What was said then may be said with equal force to-day, namely, that there was in the idea of bringing together the various scattered British provinces and giving them a common national aspiration, and making of them a common nation, that which would make the heart of any Canadian beat with patriotism. Sir, I know one thing. What I say now, will be discounted—what I say now, I may say, has been already discounted in a certain press. It will be said that such language as I utter is meant for Ontario, and would not be repeated in Quebec. It will be said that it is all very well in Ontario to speak as a Canadian, but that the language I utter to the people of Quebec is that of the establishment

OF A FRENCH INDEPENDENT STATE

on the banks of the St. Lawrence. Sir, in so far as I am personally concerned, I resent such an imputation, In so far as I am personally concerned I resent the imputation that I would have one language for Ontario and another for Quebec. I call upon my bitterest foe

ever to quote a word of mine that I have ever uttered in Quebec or wherever I may have spoken that is different, Sir, from what I have now said. I would despise myself if I had not the courage of my convictions. And whether I stood upon the soil of Ontario, or whether I stood upon the soil of my native province of Quebec addressing my countrymen of kindred blood, my language has ever been what it is here this evening. It so happens, Mr. Chairman, that the last time I spoke upon the soil of my native province it was upon this very question. It was upon the 24th of June last. The occasion was the celebration of "St. Jean Baptiste," which, you know, is the national holiday of the French Canadians. I spoke in the very heart of the city of Quebec, in the division that I have the honor of representing in Parliament. I spoke to an audience that was exclusively French and I spoke in my native tongue. With your permission, I will read to you what I said on that occasion to my fellow-countrymen of French origin, and which can be read in the columns of *L'Electeur* of the 25th June. I had to respond to the toast of "Canada." I said this :—

(Here the speaker cited a passage from the preceding speech.—*See pages* 527-28.)

Sir, such was the language which I held to my fellow-countrymen of French origin, in my own native province of Quebec, and such is the language I hold this evening. If any there are amongst my fellow-countrymen of French origin who have ever dreamed of forming themselves into

A SMALL COMMUNITY OF FRENCHMEN

on the banks of the St. Lawrence, I am not one of them. I am not one of them, I say—let my words be heard by friend or foe. Sir, I will go further. When the fate of arms and the power of treaty made my

ancestors subjects of England,it is a matter of history that they continued to wage against England a long struggle. They complained—and in my judgment they complained with justice—that they were not fairly treated; but history attests that in that long struggle the only thing which they claimed was the privileges of British subjects. The concession did not come at once. The concession was long to be made; but it came, and when it came the concession was made without any reservation, in the most ample manner; and this I say, that it would be the blackest ingratitude if, after we had sought from England the privileges and the rights of British subjects, we were now to reject the responsibilities of British subjects. I say that it would be the blackest ingratitude if, having sought the protection of Britain to grow strong, we were, when strong enough, to attempt to stab the friendly hand and to refuse to cast in our lot with those who are fellow-countrymen of ours, whose fellow-countrymen we are in deed, and whose birthright we claim as our own inheritance since we became subject to England. But, Mr. Chairman, at the same time let me tell you this: I am not here to play the part of a sycophant; I am not here to flatter the peculiar views of those whom I am addressing; I am here as a French Canadian and I am firmly attached to the language of my ancestors. Men there are amongst you, it is true, to tell you that it is dangerous to Confederation that the French language should be spoken in this great country of ours. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am a French Canadian; I was brought up

ON THE KNEES OF A FRENCH MOTHER;

and my first recollections are those recollections which no man ever forgets; and shall it be denied to me—the privilege of addressing the same language to those that are dear to me? Shall I not continue to speak French as French was spoken to me in my

younger days? I know very well, that it is a great disadvantage for a French Canadian not to speak English. I understand that my friend, Mr. Ross, is to compel all pupils in this great country to learn English, and he will do a great service to all the children of this country. But I believe that Mr. Ross will not prohibit anybody from speaking the language of his mother if he chooses to speak it. I simply claim the privilege of speaking my own domestic language as I like to speak it. But men who speak only French on this continent are in a great inferiority, and if they are to learn to speak English the consequence will be that they will speak two languages, and the advantage will be all on their side. When Confederation was established, Mr. Chairman, it was not intended that Confederation should be based upon the humiliation of any one race. It was not intended that any should give up its characteristic, but it was expected that though every nationality might retain its individuality, yet that all would be actuated by one aspiration and would endeavor to form one nation. It is, in this spirit, it is according to the Liberal party, it is in accordance with the principle laid down at the outset of Confederation that there should be several provinces, that there should be a division, but a union of the whole. That we have acted upon—an action for which we have been subjected to too many criticisms. I refer to the act passed by the Legislature of Quebec with respect to

THE JESUITS' ESTATES.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am here entering upon a delicate statement. I have taken one view, and in stating this I ask one privilege. It is the privilege of of laying my views as I entertain them. I only ask one thing of you. It is what is never refused by a British audience—it is to give me fair play in the statement I intend to make. I know that will be granted whether you agree with my conclusions or

not. This bill, in the first place, passed comparatively in silence. It was a long time before the Legislature. Public attention was not directed to it. Not one word was said against it, and it finally passed and had the unanimous consent of the Legislature of Quebec; but after the act had been passed petitions which had not come to the Legislature were sent to His Excellency, or rather to the Government, and finally to His Excellency to disallow the act. The Government refused, and the motion of censure against that course of the Government was introduced into the House of Commons by a well-known supporter of the Government—Colonel O'Brien. Well, I see that the action of Colonel O'Brien meets with approval. Gentlemen, thank God, this is a free country and I do not object. But if it met the approval of a large portion of the people of Ontario, it did not meet the approval of the Government. Now, gentlemen, I tell you this: I have no spare love for the Government, and I am willing enough to admit that it will always be a labor of love for me to work and help Colonel O'Brien or any other member when they go against the Government. Upon that occasion, however, I could not. The question was not a new one; it had been debated over and over again between the two parties. The question of Provincial rights, which was involved in that motion, has been an issue between the Conservative party and the Liberal party. The Conservative party, represented at Ottawa by the Government of Sir John Macdonald, had always held the doctrine—and they applied that doctrine here in the province of Ontario—that they had

THE RIGHT TO REVIEW LOCAL LEGISLATION,

and to disallow anything they considered in any way objectionable. On the contrary, the Liberal party always maintained that the legislation passed by the Local Legislature was amenable, and amenable only, to the people of the province where it had been

enacted. Upon that occasion—whether right or wrong for good or for ill—we stood by our principles, but the Government did not. They turned a somersault; they turned a somersault noticeable even in a Government distinguished by the audacity, rapidity and continuance of its antics. Now, Sir, with regard to this question, I know that our course has not been approved by all Liberals. The great newspaper with which you, Sir, are connected, *The Globe*, the veteran of Reform—(*hisses*)—why should any man hiss because another has the courage of his convictions? I do not agree with *The Globe*, and I have no fault to find with *The Globe* because it disagreed with me. *The Globe* is Liberal and I am Liberal, and we Liberals are not of the men who do not see any good in others. Now, Sir, with regard to this question, I do not think it would be fitting in me while before such an audience to discuss that question on its merits, except in so far as it relates to the question of disallowance, and in that view I only intend to discuss it. That is the only point from which I intend to discuss this question, which came up in Quebec and which had to be settled in some way or other. Now Mr. Chapleau, the other day, not later than 15 days ago, said, in a speech delivered at St. Hilaire, that, while he was Prime Minister, he had entered into negotiations to settle the question, and that if he had settled it

HE WOULD HAVE SETTLED IT

to the satisfaction of everybody—to the satisfaction of Catholics, to the satisfaction of Protestants—but he did not settle it, and it does not lie in the mouth of him who confessed that he attempted and failed, to say that what was done was not well done. But this was a question that had to be settled. Now, many objections have been taken against it; there are many objections which I could discuss which have been raised against it, and in discussing these you will bear with me. I only ask one

thing, fair-play, while I discuss the question. I ask of you simply to be heard. I do not know that I shall be able to convince you; I de not hope for that. But at least you will not refuse to a fellow-countryman coming here to argue an unpopular cause a fair hearing, I hope. Now I believe one thing, that the whole of that act would have passed without any trouble whatever, it would not have aroused any excitement, but for the fact that the name of the Pope was prominently introduced in it, and that its introduction was construed in such a manner as to mean a thing which I shall presently discuss—that it was putting the supremacy of the Pope over the supremacy of the Queen. Gentlemen, I think I put the question fairly; I want to put it honestly and to discuss it manfully. I know one thing—I know enough of my fellow-countrymen of English origin, I know enough of English history, I know enough of English literature, to be aware that when Shakespeare put into the mouth of King John the proud words which he made him address to the Pope's legate:—

> No Italian priest
> Shall tithe or toll in our dominion.

he touched the British heart in its most responsive chord. I know this, that there is no man of English blood, let his condition in life be ever so humble, let his range of information be ever so limited, but knows this much of English history—that at no time would the English people or English sovereigns allow the sway of the Pope in the temporal affairs of England. Now, my fellow-countrymen, allow me to go one step further. The objection which you have to this act is simply this—you say that this act has attempted to do

WHAT NEVER WAS DONE IN ENGLAND.

Let me tell you, if you allow me to discuss the matter calmly with you, there never was any such intention

on the part of Mr. Mercier! Let me go again one step further and do not hiss too soon, because I will be forced to tell you that in the discussion which took place when Mr. Mercier introduced that act he stated to the British minority that if they found any objection to the preamble, that need be no difficulty, for it could easily be arranged to please them. The explanations, however, which he gave were satisfactory to the British minority and they voted unanimously in favor of the act. Now, my fellow-countrymen, let me again go one step further. If you believe that it was ever the intention of any Roman Catholic in Lower Canada to put the supremacy of the Pope over the supremacy of the Queen, I disclaim in the most emphatic manner any such intention. There is no Christian organization in which Christ's great precept "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's," is so rigidly enforced as in the Roman Catholic persuasion. Now, my fellow-countrymen, allow me again to go one step further. You say we have carried too far the doctrine of no disallowance, that we have introduced the possibility of the supremacy of the Pope over the supremacy of the Queen. What would you do now, you ask me, if the Legislature of Quebec were to attempt to substitute the authority of the Pope for the authority of the Queen? Gentlemen, I put this question squarely. This is my answer—there never was such a pretension on the part of the Legislature of Quebec. But I go further, and will meet the objection as squarely as it is possible to meet it. Suppose that the Legislature of Quebec, or any other Legislature—mind you, I speak to you now as one of your fellow-countrymen from Quebec, I speak to you as one of the majority in Quebec—were ever to attempt to substitute the authority of the Pope over the authority of the Queen, that Legislature, by that very fact, would place itself beyond the pale of the Canadian Confederation, would place itself beyond the pale of British citizenship, and that act would be simply treason and would have to be

DEALT WITH AS TREASON.

Sir, this is simply the answer which I have to give upon this occasion to the many strictures which have been heaped upon the Liberal party for that act, which have been heaped upon the Liberal party for refusing to disallow that act. But, Sir, there is another objection which is made to this act. It is an objection which I find expressed in the press of Ontario. It is stated that the men in whose favor that legislation was made are enemies of progress, enemies of freedom, that it was a crime on the part of the Liberal party, a crime on the part of every one who believes in freedom and modern progress, not to use the power of disallowance in order to remove such a dangerous weapon from such dangerous hands. That is the view, undoubtedly, which has been taken by several of those of our fellow-citizens who lately organized themselves as the Equal Rights Association. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not of those who pretend to dismiss the movement which was thus organized by a simple wave of the hand. A movement in which you find eminent divines, prominent members of Parliament, men ranking high in every station of life, all eminently animated by strong conviction, is a movement, which must be met with respect, which must always rouse in every manly heart a recognition

OF THE SPIRIT OF CONVICTION.

I have followed that movement, though I cannot agree in all its conclusions. I have followed it with great interest, I have followed all the discussion as nearly as I could, and I must say that I have been strongly impressed by the speech delivered recently here in Toronto, at the convention which was held in June last, by a fellow-countryman of yours, Rev. Principal Caven. Now, I have not the honor to know Dr. Caven. But I must say, and I am glad to say,

that his speech impressed me as the speech of a man of elevated mind, of high views, firm in temper, kind and gentle in disposition. I read his speech, as I said, with great interest, and I thought I found in the words which he then uttered the reason for the attitude which he had taken. His views were expressed in the following language:—

> The theory that the Church is paramount in the secular as in the religious sphere has come into collision with the theory on which all free public life proceeds, and in accordance with which our modern civilization is being developed. To my own mind it is this fact which lends importance to the situation with which we have to deal, and makes it the imperative duty of those who reject the first of those theories and regard it as dangerous to the community, to resist legislation such as the Acts of which we complain. The Ultramontane theory of Government is distinctly avowed and constantly proclaimed by its advocates, so that we are not to be charged with misrepresenting the Jesuits and others who defend it; and we need not be surprised when the champions of this theory proceed under favorable circumstances to reduce it to practice.

These words seem to me very pregnant, very expressive of the thought in Dr. Caven's mind that the Ultramontanes would take advantage of this legislation to undermine our free institutions. Well, let us meet the case in that way. Suppose that indeed the Ultramontanes were to use the privilege granted to them to undermine our free institutions, how should we treat them? This question has been put again and again by the *Mail*. It has been put with great force, with great talent, but in my judgment in a manner which is not compatible with

THE ETHICS OF ENGLISH LIBERALISM.

The views of the *Mail* upon that subject have been thus expressed in a late issue:—

> In a recent article on the career of John Bright, Karl Blend, a Liberal of Liberals, lays it down that true Liberalism

does not consist in furnishing the enemy of human progress and enlightenment with weapons wherewith he may cut its throat. Karl Blend is a German Liberal, but repeats the formula which the Liberals of all continental countries have adopted in their dealing with Ultramontanism.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this may be indeed German Liberalism, but this is not the true English Liberalism. What is the meaning of this Liberalism. It means simply that if an Ultramontane is entitled to an act of justice he must be denied that act of justice because it may, perhaps, be used to the prejudice of the community. This is not the way I have read English Liberalism. I am of French origin, but there never was a time in my life when I did not proclaim myself an English Liberal. I am a French Canadian Liberal and I belong to a party which for thirty years fought the Ultramontanes in the province of Quebec. But this I do say, consistently with those principles of English Liberalism which I profess, that, if an Ultramontane or any other man is entitled to justice at my hands, ample justice he shall receive from me. In the discussion which has taken place,it has been said over and over again that the men who are supposed to benefit most from this legislation have been expelled from all civilized countries, have been expelled from France, from Republican France, as late as the year 1883. Well, Sir, I never could conceive what was the object of making reference to that fact. Can it be possible that those who refer to that fact intend that we should revert

TO THE POLICY OF OSTRACISM

so long indulged in European countries and yet indulged in the land of my ancestors,France. I do not believe there is a man in this audience who would have us return to the old time when men were ostracized because their views were not the views of the majority of those with whom they happened to live. If not for that purpose, what could the purpose be?

Perhaps it was that these men were dangerous men. But let them be ever so dangerous, dangerous and bad men have rights which good men are bound to respect. Gentlemen of English origin, let me tell you this, as a man who has nothing but French blood in his veins, that I am ashamed of the land of my ancestors when I reflect that at this day, at this time of the nineteenth century, still ostracism can be proclaimed in a country which calls itself Republican. Let me tell you this, that that action has been reproved by all true Liberals in the French Republic. Why, this very question was reviewed only recently in the monthly number of Harper's Magazine, in an article headed "The Religious Movement in France." It was written by Mr. Edmond de Pressensé, a member of the French Senate. What gives, in my judgment, peculiar force to the opinion of Mr. de Pressensé is the fact that he is a Protestant. This is the way in which he speaks of the very fact to which I now refer:

> Besides the secular clergy the Church of France long possessed a very numerous regular clergy, representing the various religious orders of Catholicism. These religious orders —Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits and others—were distributed in congregations recognized by the State, and in congregations not recognized by the State, of which latter the most important was the Society of Jesus. A few years ago, it will be remembered, the Republican Government revived some old laws, which had their *raison d'être* under the Gallican Monarchy, and issued decrees for the expulsion of all the non-recognized religious orders. Thus many religious houses were closed, not without resistance which occasioned tumultuous scenes and greatly agitated public opinion. In reality the measure had no great importance.

There is

THE OPINION OF A PROTESTANT—

the opinion of a Liberal. You do not see that he here proposes that the Republican Government should expel the Jesuits. But in another part of his

article he condemns that action in unqualified terms:

> The third Republic, irritated, it is true, by the spirit of opposition which it encountered amongst the clergy at its *début*, has often displayed passionate hostility, according to Gambetta's saying. "Le cléricalisme, c'est l'ennemi." The exaggerated manner in which it has applied the principle of secularization, both in the educational laws, where it has not given a legitimate place to that religious teaching which might have been imparted at special hours without constraining any consciences, and also in pitilessly driving out of the hospitals the Sisters of Charity, has naturally excited the liveliest dissatisfaction, not only amongst the clergy, but in a considerable portion of the nation as well. This dissatisfaction constitutes at the present moment a real danger for Republican institutions, and everybody knows only too well by whom it is fraudulently taken advantage of.

Here, again, you see the opinion of a Liberal Protestant, and, instead of approving of the act of the Republic, he condemns it, though he acknowledges that there publican party in France, while acting thus, acted under great provocation. For it is a matter of history that after the elections which followed the unfortunate war of 1870, the Catholic party—I say Catholic party because I am sorry to say there is a party of Catholics who have committed

THE GREAT MISTAKE

(I would say crime) of organizing themselves as a political party—the Catholic party threw its weight against the republic. "Hence the bitter resentment of the republicans, who, when once they came back with a majority, made the mistake of allowing their policy to be inspired by their anger."

Now, my fellow-countrymen, let me pause here. Here is a country where some old laws—laws of the old monarchy—were revived in order to expel Jesuits. Let us look to the other side of the channel! Let us look to England! There also you will find old laws, still unrepealed—still upon the statute book—which

might be revived to deal out justice in the same way in which it was meted out in France. But these men, expelled from France, were allowed to go in peace in England. Now, my fellow-countrymen of British origin, I ask you this: I am a Frenchman. You are Englishmen. Which example,of these two countries, do you wish to follow in this country? You are Englishmen. You can go to France for an example. I am French descent, but this time, as always, I go for an example to the great country which first in the world introduced the great principle that no man should be persecuted because of his religion. Sir, if I were looking for an expression of

THE VIEWS OF THE TRUE LIBERALS

among my countrymen on this occasion, I should find them in the words of one of the most eminent Frenchmen of this century, Mr. Guizot. The occasion was the reception of Father Lacordaire into the French Academy. In France they do these things with great ceremony. There are only forty Academicians; when one dies an election takes place; the new member is introduced to the Academy, and he has to deliver a speech, to which another Academician must make an answer. On this occasion that duty fell to Mr. Guizot. That occasion was a very important one, because Father Lacordaire wrs not only one of the greatest orators of his day, but was also one of the purest men, one of the noblest characters, to be found in any age and in any land. The man who was to answer him was well known as an orator, an historian, and a statesman. But what added to the interest of the occasion was the contrast between the two men, Mr. Guizot being a Protestant, a Huguenot, a descendant of a long persecuted minority, whereas Father Lacordaire was a monk of the Dominican order instituted in mediæval times to fight heresy. The occasion suggested to Mr. Guizot some noble words which I think should be taught as a lesson for

all men who live in such a country as we live in—a country of mixed religions:

What would have happened, Sir, if we had met, you and I, six hundred years ago, and if it had been the lot of both of us to influence our mutual destinies? I have no inclination to awake recollections of discord and violence, but I would not respond to the expectation of the generous public who listen to us, and of the larger public outside who have taken such a strong interest in your election, if I were not, as they are, moved by and proud of the beautiful contrast between what takes place to-day in this hall and what would have taken place in former times, under similar circumstances. Six hundred years ago, if my own people had met you, full of wrath they would have assailed you as an odious persecutor, and your own people, eager to inflame the victors against heretics, would have shouted. "Strike and again strike; God will well know his own." You have taken to heart, Sir, and far be it from me to contest it, you have taken to heart to wipe from such atrocities the memory of the illustrious founder of the religious order to which you belong; for surely the reproach is not to be addressed to him, but to the age in which he lived, and to all parties during many centuries. It is not my habit, I dare say so, to speak of my own time and to my contemporaries with a complacent admiration. The more warmly I desire their happiness and their glory, the more I feel inclined to point out to them what they are still wanting in, to comply with their great destinies. But I cannot deny to myself the joy, and shall I say it, the pride of the spectacle which the Academy is now exhibiting to all eyes. We are here, you and I, Sir, the living evidences and the happy witnesses of the sublime progress which has taken place in intelligence of and respect for justice, conscience, right and those divine laws so long ignored, which regulate the mutual duties of men concerning God and belief in God. No one any longer smites or is smitten in the name of God: no one now lays claim to assume the rights and to anticipate the decrees of the Sovereign Judge.

Mr. Chairman, we are here to-day in this country as they were in Europe—Catholics and Protestants together. Shall we revive those old laws?

Shall we strike in the name of God? No; those times are past. But this is not enough. Shall we

anticipate the decrees of the Supreme Judge? No, as the motto at least to which the Liberal party shall always adhere, we shall say: let only opinions be free, and let the best prevail, as truth and justice must ever prevail. But, Sir, I shall be asked—we are asked every day—what will you do if the Ultramontanes of the province of Quebec make an attempt against our liberties and free institutions? Why, Sir, we shall do as in the past.

WE SHALL FIGHT THEM.

This is nothing new for us to have to do—nothing new for the party to which I belong. We have waged a long battle against the Ultramontane doctrines. We have waged a long battle during the time when the Ultramontanes in Lower-Canada were doing their very best for the Tories of Ontario, and when the Tories of Ontario never objected at all. There was an occasion only a few years ago, when an election was fought in the county of Charlevoix. Sir Hector Langevin was a candidate. He was elected and the Tories welcomed his election as a great triumph. His election was contested on the ground of undue influence on the part of the clergy. The Ultramontanes, and, indeed, the whole Tory party, maintained that the clergy had a right to use undue influence and were not amenable to civil tribunals. But we fought the question before the civil Courts, and before also the ecclesiastical authorities, and we won before both. We fought the question single-handed. Now we are told by those who did not object formerly to an alliance with Ultramontanes that we Liberals to-day are allied with the Ultramontanes. To some extent we are, I am here to speak openly, and have no reason to feel ashamed of what we have done. Sir, when Ultramontane doctrines interfered with our civil rights and liberties, it was our duty to fight the issue like men, and we did it. In those days I never heard a word against Ultramontanism coming from the Tory press,

while at every foot we fought the Ultramontane party. This is not the place to attack Ultramontanes: the proper ground of attack and defense, on this subject, is on the soil of the province of Quebec. I will only say here that the Ultramontanes, like all French Canadian Conservatives, had borrowed their political views not from the British, but from the French school of politics.

I may say here, Mr. Chairman, that ever since I have been in politics, now more than twenty-two years, I have always striven in my native province to inculcate

TRUE LIBERAL ENGLISH PRINCIPLES.

I always repudiated French Liberalism, not my origin, mind you, not the land of my ancestors, but I always repudiated those ideas which have brought the country of my ancestors to its present reduced condition. I wanted to bring in better ideas. The Ultramontane party now fought us with some reason, now with no reason. But their dogmatic politics will not long remain under the cover of British institutions. For a long time they were the mainstay of the party of Sir John Macdonald. But there came a time when they could no longer remain so. The first occasion when they found themselves unable to follow the leadership of Sir John Macdonald was in connection with that License Act which you will all remember. They completely severed themselves also from the party and Government of Sir John Macdonald on the outrageous Franchise Bill. At that time I was not in the position that I now occupy, but I occupied a position of some responsibility in the representation of my native province. There was a question fronting us. The Ultramontane party had lost confidence in the Government and in the party of Sir John Macdonald, and we had never had any confidence in him. Were the Opposition to refuse the votes of the Ultramontanes because they could not accept all the

Ultramontane ideas? Well, Sir, I had several interviews at that time with a man who was one of the leaders of the party. He was a personal friend of mine, although we differed in politics. I allude to Senator Trudel, whom I admire for the courage of his convictions, though I do not agree with them all. I asked him a few days ago if he would allow me to make public what had passed between us. He consented in the following note, which I take the liberty of reading:—

Montreal, 19th Sept., 1889.

MY DEAR LAURIER:

I perfectly remember that in all our conversations, as you put it very correctly, "agreeing upon some questions, differing on many others, we were of opinion that it was preferable that the National Conservatives should be organized as a distinct party, with an acknowledged leader." You might have added that, while agreeing upon the necessity of opposing the *parti bleu*, for their numerous misdeeds, we respectively reserved our perfect freedom to act upon political questions as we might deem best for the good of the country. You have perfect liberty to state the above facts when and where you shall choose. I even desire that you should do so. Because I am of the opinion that as a general rule, truth should see the light of day. If there are any exceptions to that rule they must be very few, and nothing but good must result from the fact that upon every question the public should have the trnth and the whole truth.

Sir, those are the facts, and I see nothing but what is perfectly honorable for the Liberal party and for the Ultramontanes of Lower Canada in that respect. I submit this with all confidence to the approval and to the judgment of my fellow-countrymen. Now, Sir, I have dilated perhaps too long upon this question; but when I came to Ontario I thought that I would not discharge my duty fully if I shirked any of the issues which are now agitating the public opinion of Ontario. Sir, now I may say this: These recent events to which I have alluded have created in many minds the impression that we of the Liberal party have

carried too far the doctrine of provincial rights. I submit, on the contrary, that these recent events to which I have alluded—and the whole history of Confederation has shown the fact—that the power of disallowance is the

GREATEST DANGER TO CONFEDERATION

to-day. The power of disallowance vested in the Central Government is not, mind you, the logical consequence of the federative principle. On the contrary, it is altogether antagonistic to that principle. The federative principle is that every Legislature - whether it be the Local Legislature or whether it be the Central Legislature—should be perfectly independent of each other; and, to my mind, if you interfere with the independence of one you completely make away with its utility. I quite understand, Sir, that the Imperial Parliament should keep the power of disallowance over the legislation of the Dominion Parliament. This is not the consequence of the federative principle. This is in consequence of our dependency as a colony. Being dependent, it is nothing but right that the supreme power should retain to itself the power of disallowance if it so thinks fit. But, Sir, we are a loyal people; we boast of our loyalty every day; yet I submit that the people of Canada never would tolerate from the Imperial Government what the Government of Canada is trying to impose upon the provnces. Two or three years ago, when the Inter-provincial Conference met in Quebec, they discussed that subject, and they very properly determined that it would be a proper amendment to our constitution that the power of veto, of disallowance of local legislation as well as of the Dominion legislation, should be vested in the Imperial Government. The discussion which then took place has shown this, that in our constitution a great mistake was made, and that when the power of disallowance was vested in the Central Government, principle was sacrificed to expediency. It was then said that

the power of disallowance was necessary for the protection of minorities. But what has been the result? The power of disallowance has been shamefully made use of by the Conservative party for party purposes. It has been exercised or it has been withheld just

AS SUITED PARTY PURPOSES.

Sir, there is to-day a sentiment of difference between Ontario and Quebec. This is not of to-day only. This existed in former times. Remember, gentlemen, the old veterans of former times; remember when the people of Upper Canada complained that in local questions their will was superseded by the will of the people of Quebec! Remember the old struggles that were waged by Mr. George Brown and by our friend, Mr. Mowat, upon this question! In fact Confederation was largely the result of the discontent which was aroused in Ontario, in consequence of the fact that the will of the people of Ontario was superseded by the Quebec majority which supported the Government of that time. Do you want, my fellow-countrymen, to see those old days revived? If you want to see those old days revived, just let this policy prevail of allowing the supreme power in the Government of Canada, to set its will against the will of the people of the provinces. Remember the conflict which was created only a few years ago, when the Government of Sir John Macdonald, shocked and horrified by the injustice of Mr. Mowat passing such a law as the streams' bill, disallowed it. Well, what the people of Ontario complained of at that time the people of Quebec would complain of to-day. Sir I simply say this, that in the sphere which is allotted to every Legislature.

THE ONLY TRIBUNAL

to which this Legislature is amenable is the people which elected it. But, Sir, it is said that the Legislature may pass a law which would be prejudicial to

the general interests of Canada, and that in such a case such a law should be disallowed. But are you quite sure that the power of disallowance, thus exercised, will be more in the interest of Canada than the law disallowed? Take the case of Manitoba. The people of Manitoba believed that railway competition was in the interest of their province. The Government of Canada asserted that monopoly in Manitoba was essential to the benefit of Canada, and, in consequence of that assertion, the Government of Canada disallowed the will of the people of Manitoba which wanted railway competition. Will any one tell me here that the Government of Canada, when it set its will against the people of Manitoba, acted for the best interests of Canada? Will any one tell me that if you create discontent in a province you will promote general welfare in Canada? Will any one tell me, in fact, when we have a system which allows local questions to be determined by local bodies, that it is for the general good that those local bodies should have their will set aside by a superior power? Sir, I am not of this mind; you cannot be of this mind; and the people of Ontario have not been up to this moment of this mind; but you are told every day—and this is what is at the bottom of this agitation—that the majority of the people in Quebec are abusing their power to promote legislation which is offensive to the Protestant minority. Sir, this is the statement which has been made, I know. But let me tell you this, my fellow-countrymen: If my fellow-countrymen, the Protestants of Quebec, have any legislation of which they have just right to complain, let me just tell you this—though that is a thing which I am not prepared at this moment to admit—every single piece of that legislation has been passed with their concurrence. Sir, the Protestant minority of Quebec, for reasons of their own, for reasons which I shall not at this moment discuss, have invariably since the year 1854

SUPPORTED THE CONSERVATINE PARTY,

and every piece of legislation which is now signalized as being offensive to the Protestant minority has been put upon the statute book by the Conservative party; and every time with the concurrence of the Protestant minority. Now, Sir, it may be—I am not here to deny it—it may be that some of this legislation to-day is found to be offensive to the Protestant minority; but if it is so, would it not be fair to ask the Protestant minority to come before the Legislature of Quebec, and there to lay their complaint? I ask it of you, gentlemen, in the spirit of fairness which has ever characterized a British audience, is it fair, is it loyal to charge my fellow-countrymen with tyrannizing the minority? Never, never, in any one single instance, was a protest ever made to the Legislature of Quebec. Sir, I say more. I belong to a race which is not without faults, but which is, I am sure, as kind-hearted as any race to be found on the face of the earth. I belong to a race which every man of British origin who has known it has always proclaimed as one of the most peaceable and friendly to be found anywhere; and I make bold to say, in the name of my fellow-countrymen of French origin, that whenever a just complaint is made to them, that just complaint will be heard. I ask this, those who complain, if they want to go to the Governor-General, let them go; if they want to go to the Dominion Parliament, let them go; but I only ask that, before so doing, they should come to the first Legislature that can remedy their grievances, that is the Legislature in which they have the power to elect some ten or twelve members of their own persuasion and creed and origin. Had it not been for this unfortunate circumstance, that they never made any protest to the local legislature, I am sure that at no time this unfortunate controversy would have taken place. I am sure that at no time this unfortunate principle of Dominion interference in local legislation would have

been maintained; but, Sir, this is a principle which cannot be trifled with. If you once admit that the Dominion Parliament has the right to review and to annul, just by the mere motion of its hand, the legislation of any local body,

JUST AS WELL MAKE AWAY

with the whole paraphernalia of Confederation and have legislative union at once—because it will amount to legislative union. This is an issue upon which the Liberal party has fought a long, long battle. I know very well this; that this principle cannot be affirmed without giving offence now in one province and now in another province. But Confederation, Sir, cannot be worked unless we adhere to the principle in which it was conceived, which was a separation of powers between local bodies, supreme in their sphere, and the general body, also supreme in its sphere. Sir, so far we have been pretty successful. I admit we have these little difficulties, but I trust in the judgment and in the sober reflection of my fellow-countrymen of all creeds, of all races, and of all provinces, again to affirm that what was done in 1867 was good work and should be maintained. Now, Sir, under that system, since 1867 we have been, I must say, pretty successful. We have not been as successful as we might have been, and there is one thing which, for one, I deeply deprecate. It is that under that system, though we started with the intention of creating amongst us a new nation, we have not yet succeeded in creating a national sentiment through the breadth and length of the Dominion of Canada. This is a thing which we must strive after, and this is a thing for which the Liberal party is every day striving, but we cannot achieve that object unless we are able to show our people that it will bring them the greatest amount possible of prosperity. I am not of those who would deny—if there be any who would, which I do not believe—that we have made in the way of progress gigantic strides, still

WE HAVE NOT DONE

all we should have done. It was said of a king of antiquity that he said "nothing is done as long as there is something to do." It is true that the Conservative party tell us every day that we are the most prosperous people on the face of the earth, that milk and honey flow in the land—though you do not see it much—that everything is for the best in the best of worlds; but, though the Conservative party every day sing pæans in favor of the present state of things, their actions, I submit, tell a different tale. They will not tell you that we should change anything; they will not tell you that we should reform any thing. Reform is a hateful word to them, but though they do not tell you in so many words, you find in their actions evidences that they are not altogether satisfied with the present state of things. In the very ranks of the Conservative party, you have an association formed to promote Imperial Federation. What does this mean? It certainly means that in their estimation something should be done. Well, I am not one of those who believe in

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

What we need is not a political reform, at this moment, it is not a change in our political status. What we want is a commercial and economic reform. This thought has been well illustrated in the House of Commons itself within the ranks of the Conservative party in the session of 1888. In the session of 1888, Mr. Marshall, a supporter of the Government, moved a resolution affirming in substance that it would be to the advantage of Canada to have closer commercial relations with the mother country. Such a resolution, couched in such a few words could not be satisfactory. Accordingly, Mr. Dalton McCarthy gave notice of another motion which was more proper, and this is what he intended to offer to the House:

That it would be in the local interests of the Dominion that such changes should be sought for in the trade relations

between the United Kingdom and Canada as would give Canada advantages in the markets of the mother country not allowed to foreign States, Canada being willing for such privileges to discriminate in her markets in favor of Great Britain and Ireland, due regard being had to the policy adopted in 1879 for the purpose of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion and to the financial necessities of the Dominion.

This resolution, I said, was not moved. The author had no occasion to move it, or develop it, but on the motion of Mr. Marshall he indicated that the policy adopted should be that England should receive our cereals free of duty, but tax the cereals of every other country, and if they would do that we would be so magnanimous as to lower the tariff by a few inches which we have put in the face of British industries. Well, I may say this at once, I would be in favor of a more close commercial alliance of Canada with Great Britain. I would favor it with all my soul. But, Sir, if there is any man who believes that any such alliance between Canada and Great Britain can be formed upon any other basis than that of free trade which prevails in England, that man is a " Rip van Winkle" who has been sleeping not only for the last seven years, but for the last fourty-four years. Why, Mr. Chairman, the British people will not to-day go back

ON THE POLICY OF FREE TRADE

which they have adopted, and Canada is not in a position at this moment, with the large revenue which she has to collect, to adopt any other tariff than a revenue tariff at best. So that the conditions are not equal upon which you can form a closer commercial alliance between Canada and Great Britain; but there is alongside of us a kindred nation economically situated as we are—the United States—and we claim that that commercial alliance which at this moment is not possible with England is possible with the United States, and the policy which we have advocated,

which we still continue to advocate, is the removal of all commercial barriers between this country and the great kindred nation to the south of us. Now, Sir, there is not a man in this audience, there is not a man in Canada, I venture to say, who, if he were to speak the honest conviction of his heart, would not say that this would be a most advantageous policy to Canada. Still that policy is objected to. On what ground? On the same ground of distrust and diffidence to which I alluded at a former stage, and which seems to permeate every feature of our national life. Men there are who tell you that if we had unrestricted reciprocity we would have annexation. But I ask those men, if they voted for

UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY,

would they be disfranchised? Will they not be able to vote against annexation if that becomes a question? It is idle to talk about this. I am sorry to say that some of those who started to fight the battle of reciprocity have since grown faint-hearted. We are told that our chances of securing reciprocity have been diminished because the Democrats were defeated in the last Presidential election. During Mr. Cleveland's administration, it is said, it would have been possible to obtain unrestricted reciprocity; there would have been some chance. Now, Sir, my good friend, Sir Richard Cartwright, moved his first motion in favor of reciprocity in the year 1888—in the very year the Presidential election was held, and if there is any man who at that time, with a knowledge of history, expected that reciprocity would be brought about in the course of twelve months or twenty months, he has not read history as I have read it. I have read it in this way, that every reform has cost to the reformers years of labor, and those years of labor I for one am prepared to give, and though the Democrats may be defeated in the States and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, as long as

I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until that cause is successful. I will not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of Opposition until the cause has triumphed, and you never shall hear a complaint from me. But some think that, though unrestricted reciprocity is possible, it is not probable. We are

ON THE EVE OF TRIUMPH.

The triumph is at our hands if we only know how to play our cards. Some men say they are discouraged because the Democrats have been defeated and the Republicans are in power, and they say we cannot have from the Republican party what the Democratic party would have been prepared to give us. Sir, I am afraid with those people the wish is father to the impression. If any one will read the evidences which are now going on the other side of the line, he will see that there is no cause to be discouraged because the Republicans are in power. Why, in this very month there is to assemble at Washington a Congress of American nations, summoned by the Government of the day, to discuss what? To discuss closer commercial relations between the United States and those nations. Well, certainly what can be discussed with the southern republics by the American Government can be well discussed by the American Government with the Canadian Government. I can see no reason why we should not attempt to do the same. This convention is to meet under a resolution of Congress which reads as follows:—

The adoption of uniform patent and copy-right laws; the establishment of regular and frequent communication between the different countries participating in the conference: the selection of a plan of settling international disputes; the adoption of a uniform silver coinage, and of a uniform standard of weights and measures; the adoption of a uniform standard of customs and tariff duties.

Is that plain enough? The adoption of a uniform standard of Customs and tariff duties. I am not prepared to say I would be disposed to concur in all which is here asserted, but I do certainly say that the Government of the United States is disposed to discuss Reciprocity with Canada, if Canada wants Reciprocity. I say more; the question of Reciprocity in the United States has not yet become a party question, and I do hope, on my part—I would prefer—that it should not be made

A PARTY QUESTION.

I prefer to see it remain what it is—a geographical question, interesting the Northern and Central States; and if it be kept in those lines I have much hope of an early success. It is quite evident that the Republican Government of President Harrison is disposed to discuss to-day unrestricted reciprocity with the neighboring States or Republics, and is therefore disposed to discuss Reciprocity with Canada if Canada only wants unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We must not lose heart. There is no cause to lose heart. It is most important that we make proselytes not only amongst ourselves, but amongst our American neighbors. There is great encouragement to the Liberal party, to all who think well of their country and who are disposed to study her best interests, in the fact that Massachusetts, ever forward in the cause of advanced legislation, has almost unanimously pronounced by the mouth of its business men in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. That being the case, all the more reason there is why we should go on with the agitation we have commenced not yet two years ago. And, Sir, there is more than that. There are at this moment indications that the Government of Sir John Macdonald are preparing, as the vulgar phrase goes, "to dish the Liberals." What, you will say, is the meaning of this? Well, the literal signification of it is that Sir John, still audacious, intends

TO STEAL THE CLOTHES

of the Liberal party, and is preparing at the next election to present himself in the habiliments so boldly stolen. Well, we can stand it. We are not to be pitied! Oh, no! The men to be pitied are the poor Tories who have for so long bawled themselves hoarse on the theme, to them so congenial, of the danger to Imperial Confederation which lurks in unrestricted reciprocity with the great nation to the south of us. The party to be pitied is not the Liberal party, but the party which is compelled to swallow the dose they now aver to be so nauseous to the country and detrimental to Canada. But, nauseous as the dose is, they will, as in the past, swallow it. If it is necessary to retain them in power, it is not at all too sickening for the Tory stomach. But if the Liberals are to be pitied even a little at this time, it is that after all the abuse heaped upon them they have to provide clothes for those who have most reviled them. The Tories whenever they get a new suit never attempt to put it off until it is torn and in rags; and then when the hour of Tory necessity comes, when their nakedness is but too apparent, the Liberals are dished and their clothes are stolen. The Liberal party to-day, as in the past, stands true to its Liberal principles; above all, it stands true to the country and to the interests that will best inure to its welfare and prosperity. If Sir John Macdonald will adopt our programme and give us unrestricted reciprocity, with all my heart, in the matter, I will pledge him that he will have the most emphatic support. I am not sure, however, that he will go as far as that. I am quite prepared to believe that he will take

A LITTLE BIT OF RECIPROCITY,

and then another little bit of reciprocity, and then say to the people of Canada: Well, we went on our knees to the Yankees, and we could not get any more.

Even if he goes a little in this way, if he secures even a little bit of reciprocity, it will be so much done; we will take fresh courage and look for more, because I tell you the Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they triumph and obtain Continental Free Trade. We are asked sometimes, gentlemen, what is the programme of the Liberal party. This is the programme of the Liberal party:—To obtain continental freedom of trade. That is our programme at this moment. But, gentlemen, others of you will say, is that the only question? Are there no other questions pressing for solution? Yes, gentlemen, there are other questions, and important questions, too, that will soon come into the arena of active politics; but as I read history, as I read Canadian history, one great reform at a time is as much as a party can effect, and if we fix our eyes steadily on one reform and devote all our energies to its accomplishment, success will certainly crown our efforts at no distant day; fixing our eyes steadily upon the goal, we shall go on steadily until we reach it—unrestricted continental reciprocity. Mr. Baldwin devoted his life to one single reform, that of responsible government. Mr. Brown gave his life to one single reform, representation by population; and if the Liberals of to-day can achieve what they now have in view, and proclaim the great principles of continental free trade, they will have done a great good to the country, they will have conferred a boon on the British race, they will have benefited mankind; they will have performed a service of which they will have every reason to be proud. Now, Sir, I will say here that

THE LIBERAL PARTY ARE UNITED

in this: What we want is not the cry of Imperial Federation as it has been set forth lately, but political, commercial and economic reform, and an alliance not limited simply to the British Empire, but which will embrace every nation sprung from the stock of Britain.

Can there be any good reason why this should not be accomplished? Can there be any reason why in such a great reform United States should be left out? I confess I can see none. The British race is the great trading race of the world. They are scattered all over the face of this earth. I am a French Canadian, speaking as a Canadian, and I say to my fellow-Canadians that the course the great Liberal party should pursue is that which will best tend towards the speedy attainment of this great object, an alliance of the whole British race upon the face of the earth; and if we obtain an alliance, a commercial alliance between Canada and the United States, we shall have fitted one link of the chain; but we should not be satisfied until ring after ring has been added, and until with a strong chain we have encircled the whole globe.

But I have done. While I have represented that the condition of our country cannot be viewed except with some little degree of anxiety and alarm, yet all of us, whatever our creed, whatever our race, whatever our province, if we only bring ourselves up to the level of trusting each other, of having confidence in our own better nature and having

A BETTER OPINION OF EACH OTHER,

we shall have good cause for hope in the future. I shall never be disturbed by wild talk, whether in Quebec or Ontario; it is only wild talk; it is only the safety valve by which the surplus steam will escape and do no harm. When the excitement has subsided, let us remember that, though divided by different tenets and of different religious creeds, we all worship the same God! Let us remember that, though divided in religious forms, still we all believe in Him who came to earth to bring to men peace and good will, and if we are true to those teachings, if we are ever ready to give and to take, to make all allowance for the opinions, nay, for the prejudices of my fellow-countrymen, for my part I never shall despair of the future of our young country.

THE DUAL LANGUAGE QUESTION

SPEECH DELIVERED BY Mr. LAURIER IN THE COMMONS ON 17th FEBRUARY, 1890,

AGAINST MR. McCARTHY'S BILL TO ABOLISH THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. SPEAKER,

If I, for one, could accept the declaration often made by the mover of this Bill, not only while introducing it, but on several occasions before, protesting that to the course which he had adopted for himself, and of which this is only the preliminary step, he was impelled by no other motive than a desire, a lofty desire, of securing the future of this country from dissension, and of ensuring peace and harmony by removing all causes of contention, I would be sorry that the honorable gentleman, harboring in his heart aims so high, should have endeavored to accomplish them by means so selfish, and so ungenerous, as those which underlie the measure which he has brought before the House. When, however, the honorable gentleman, in order to find a motive for the measure to which he called the attention of the House, invokes considerations of such far-reaching prudence, he is simply deluding himself. The honorable gentleman, no doubt, may persuade himself, but he will with difficulty convince those to whom he has been addressing himself, that his ultimate object in this matter is

simply to secure the future peace and harmony of this country, while his present action must tend to endanger the peace and harmony which happily prevail. I can find nothing in this bill, I must say, but the old,

OLD SPIRIT OF DOMINATION AND INTOLERANCE

which, in this land and in other lands, has always characterized the course of pure, unadulterated Toryism. The measure, taken by itself, disconnected from the motives which inspired it, would not be of very great importance - we are all agreed upon that—but it is of the greatest importance for this reason that it constitutes a declaration of war by the honorable gentleman and those with whom he is acting against the French race. It is a declaration of war, I say, against the French race of this country, of which the honorable gentleman, in this House, spoke in no disrespectful terms, but of which, in other places in the province of Ontario, he spoke in terms which he would not dare to repeat on the floor of this House; the hon. gentleman spoke of the French race in terms of opprobrium, which, I say again, he would not dare to repeat in this House in presence of French Canadians, who, by law, are on a plane of equality with him in this House. He would not dare to apply here to my fellow-countrymen of French origin, the terms and epithets which he applied to them on former occasions in the province of Ontario. He would not dare to say here what he said elsewhere, he would not dare to call that race here as he did elsewhere—

A "BASTARD NATIONALITY."

I have here his language, which he used not later than the 12th July last, at Stayner, Ont., where he said :

In Barrie, last election, I pointed out, in a few simple words, that the great danger which overshadowed Canada was the French national cry, this bastard nationality, not a nationality which will take us in as we will take them in, but a nationality

which begins and ends with the French race,—which begins and ends with those who profess the Roman Catholic faith, and which now threatens the dismemberment of Canada.

A "bastard nationality," a "danger to Canada"! Why, Sir, the days are not five years distant when this "bastard nationality," to use the choice words of the honorable gentleman, was unanimous in their support of the Conservative party to which the honorable gentleman, then as now, belonged; the days are not five years distant when the honorable gentleman might have counted on his fingers the members of that race in this House who did not belong to the Conservative party. And yet in those days, and as long as that race gave his party nearly the whole weight of their influence, we never heard of any danger to Canada from this French national cry. In those days the sensitiveness of the honorable gentleman, now so easily alarmed, did not seem to be in the least concerned. Nay, more, my fellow-countrymen of French origin, on the same side of the House to which he belongs, could appeal, and did appeal, to all prejudices of my own race; but that was a legitimate warfare, because the national cry was made to do service in behalf of the Conservative party, to give them office, and to procure for them the direct and indirect profits of office. The speech delivered the other night by my honorable friend, the Minister of Public Works, and to which, I must say, legitimate objection was taken by my honorable friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), was simply, in condensed form, the food which, for the last twenty-five years, has been served up every day by the Conservative ministerial press of the province of Quebec. Yet in those days not one word was ever heard as to any danger to Canada from this national cry. But matters are altered to-day. To-day the French Canadians are

NO LONGER A UNIT

in their support of the Conservative party; and what

was commendable,or at least unobjectionable,in those days, has now become a danger to Canada. A danger to Canada, Sir ! I venture to say, judging of the future by the past, that if the French Canadians were again to unite and give the whole weight of their influence to the party to which the honorable gentleman still belongs, not one word more would we heard about this danger to Canada from the French national cry ; because, though the honorable gentleman affects now to be a free lance, still he belongs to the party commanded by the Prime Minister. He may not be a very disciplined soldier, he may be carrying on a guerilla warfare, according to his methods, but after all, he is working for the benefit of the Conservative party. He has told us himself on more than one occasion. Not fifteen days ago, he said so in Collingwood,and he said so on the 12th July last, at Stayner. It is well known that it was on the 12th July last at Stayner, amongst his own constituents, that the honorable gentleman started on the war path. He then stated that he was furbishing his own weapons, and that when Parliament again met he was going to give assault to the French. His ardor was such that he deprecated the unfortunate condition of things which, under the Constitution, did not permit him to attack them wherever his ardor would impel him,but under the Constitution,he said he could attack the French language in the North-West Territories, and attack he would as soon as the occasion offered. But at the same time the honorable gentleman, addressing his constituents—all of them, probably,good Tories - was careful to tell them that he was still a Conservative, that he would remain a Conservative, and that

A CONSERVATIVE HE HOPED TO DIE ;

and I have no doubt that that is true, because I do not think the honorable gentleman has the slightest particle of Liberalism in his composition. After this, some candid souls have asked if the honorable gent-

leman was in sympathy with the Prime Minister, or if he was starting a new movement of his own.A most useless question, for whatever may be the aim of the honorable gentleman,it is quite certain that he means no harm to the Conservative party, still less to the leader of the party. Upon that occasion, he spoke of his attachment to the party, and to the leader of the party, in terms of gushing effusiveness which, I must say, the honorable gentleman is not accustomed to use. I might quote several expressions of his, but here is one which is characteristic of the whole tenor of his speech :

"I will treat my old chieftain with all tenderness, for I am still a member of the party. I cannot be read out, although I do not know what is in store for me.

The hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) is not here,but if he were here I would tell him that he can keep his soul in peace. He need not fret nor worry over what is in store for him, for I know the right honorable gentleman's astuteness too well—not to mention his nobler qualities—not to be aware that,if the honorable gentleman brings recruits to the party,he will be forgiven, and it is for recruits to the party that he is looking now. I regret that the honorable gentleman is not here as I would rather speak in his presence than in his absence, but, in all sincerity, I say that I believe he is looking for recruits for the Conservative party, while, of course, not forgetting himself. The Conservative party have been in power for a long time; they have been in power nearly continuously for thirty years and it is a matter of history that, during that time, they have been kept in power almost entirely

BY THE FRENCH CATHOLIC SUPPORT

of the province of Quebec. That is a support upon which they can no longer rely, because the people of Quebec are now divided in their political allegiance; but it must be manifest to everybody that an English

Protestant united Ontario would be just as effective for party purposes, and this seems to be the task which the honorable gentleman has set before him to accomplish. It is always an easy and a cheap task to arouse and inflame prejudices. Give me a meeting or assembly of men, whether it be small or large, and in that meeting I will find passions and prejudices, noble in themselves, but which can be easily excited into dangerous passions and prejudices. The honorable gentleman is now endeavoring to arouse prejudices which old quarrels, religious fervor, and pride of race, may have left in the breasts of his fellow-countrymen of English origin. He tells them that if the country is to be kept British all Canadians of British origin must unite; at the same time he states that he is a Conservative, that he will remain a Conservative, that he will not be separated from his leader. If the appeals which he has been making were to be successful, to whom would they profit and whom would they affect? They certainly would not affect the Conservatives, because the honorable gentleman states that he is still in allegiance with them, and that they belong to the same party. If they would affect anybody, they would affect the Liberals of Ontario, who, fearing perhaps for British connection, might be induced to follow the honorable gentleman into the Conservative party, for which he could frame a policy and of which then he would be dictator.

Well, if this movement of the honorable gentleman were to be terminated here, if it were attempted merely to do service as a party device and to end there, it might not be viewed with much alarm. If this measure of the honorable gentleman were not to be followed by any other, if it were to remain as it appears here, a measure for the

PROSCRIPTION OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

confined to the North-West Territories alone, where the French population is small, I say at once that I

would be inclined to say: Let the measure pass and let us return to those measures of practical usefulness which demand our attention. But this is not the last movement of the honorable gentleman. This is only a preliminary skirmish, soon to be followed by a general onslaught upon the whole French race in Canada. I have before me the words of the honorable gentleman, and he has more than once told us that his object is a hand-to-hand conflict with the French race of Canada. If he did not say so in so many words, there is no mistaking his meaning that his ultimate object is the annihilation of the French race as an individual people in this Dominion. In his speech at Stayner, he unfolded his whole mind, and, addressing himself to the English section of the people of the Dominion, he said:

> There is a great work cut out for us to do. Let us begin with that which seems most possible of accomplishment. Let us deal with the dual languages in the North-West. In the Local House let us deal with the teaching of French in the schools. When these two matters are settled, we will have accomplished something, and we may be able to do something better in future.

These words are quite significant. This Bill, the introduction of this measure, is simply a preliminary step, and when that is accomplished it is to be followed by something better. And what is that something better which is to follow? The honorable gentleman has not left us in doubt as to that. Here are his words:

> We must buckle on our armor.....This is a British country, and the sooner we take up our French Canadians and make them British, the less trouble will we leave for posterity, for sooner or later must this matter be settled.

Nothing can be plainer than this language. The French Canadians are to be deprived of their language, not only in the North-West Territories, but

WHEREVER THEIR LANGUAGE EXISTS.

They must be deprived of everything which constitutes their distinct individuality in this Dominion, and this must be done by legislation now; but, if not done now by legislation, in future it will be done by force and violence—by bullets and bayonets. The expression is not mine, but that of the honorable gentleman himself. It has been repeated, not once or twice, but several times in different parts of the Dominion.. So this is the policy upon which the honorable gentleman is endeavoring to form a new party, or to reorganise an old party. This is the policy the honorable gentleman offers to his fellow-countrymen of English origin. I denounce this policy as anti-Canadian; I denounce it as anti-British; I denounce it as being at variance with all the traditions of British Government in this country; I denounce it as fatal to the hope we at one time entertained, and which I, for one, am not disposed to give up, of forming a nation on this Continent. I denounce it as a crime, the consequences of which are simply shocking to contemplate. The honorable gentleman may mean nothing more than a mere party device, but he is opening the flood-gates to passions which, once aroused, perhaps no human power may be able to restrain. He is appealing to national and religious passions, the most inflexible of all passions, and—whatever may be his motive, whatever his end, whatever his purpose—his movement cannot be characterised by any other language than that of a national crime. I do not know what are the motives which are actuating the honorable gentleman; I do not know them fully. I look only at the consequences. But, whatever may be the honorable gentleman's motives, he has more than once felt impelled to repudiate the statement that he is actuated by hatred of the French race. If he were here, I would tell him that I accept his statement absolutely and entirely. Hatred is so base a sentiment that I would not impute it to him, but, if he is not actuated by hatred, it is evident that he has

A VERY STRANGE MISCONCEPTION

of the character of French Canadians, and must have a very low estimate of their moral standard. In the speech to which I have already alluded, the honorable gentleman did not hesitate to go considerably out of his way, in order to refer to the agitation which, a few years ago, passed over the province of Quebec, consequent upon the rebellion in the North-West and the execution of the chief participant in the same. He did not hesitate then to attribute the storm of indignation which, at that time, convulsed a highly emotional race, to the lowest sentiments which can actuate the human heart, and those expressions were, to a certain extent, reproduced in the House, the other day, by the honorable member for North Bruce (Mr. NcNeill), in the attempt he made to attack my honorable friend beside me (Mr. Blake) for the courageous stand which he took upon that question. The honorable member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did not hesitate to say that, if the people of Quebec took the stand they did at that time, it was from a most dishonest motive; that it was simply an attempt to stand between a criminal and justice, because the so-called criminal happened to be one of their own race.

Those who have done me the honor to pay close attention to my political career, will remember that in the County of Haldimand two or three years ago I raised the warning note. I pointed out that the province of Quebec had been worked up to madness against the Dominion authorities for daring to execute justice upon a Frenchman.

"For daring to execute justice upon a Frenchman." I repeat this sentiment in his own words. Well, I have simply this to say, that whoever declares that the position taken by the people of Quebec upon this question was not an honest one is

GUILTY OF SLANDER,

and makes a statement the truth of which he cannot prove. The honorable gentleman has not, however, the odium of having invented that charge. It has been a stock phrase of the conservative ministerial press of Ontario for the last three or four years. So long as it was simply confined to some obscure scribblers, it might be passed in silence, but when the honorable gentleman did not hesitate to give it the countenance of his name and reputation, and when, moreover, such sentiments are re-echoed in this House, I cannot allow the charge to pass unrebuked. I will meet the honorable gentleman on his own grounds. I will not dispute his expression that the people of Quebec were driven to madness on this question, but as to the motives attributed by him I will state that the people of Quebec believe in their conscience, whether right or wrong, that the execution " of that Frenchman " (to use the words of the honorable gentleman) was an unjustifiable homicide. The honorable gentleman will not forget that twenty-three of his colleagues, twenty-three of those who supported that administration like himself—most of them who, like himself will not be read out of the party, but who will remain conservatives—telegraphed to the Prime Minister that the execution would be a crime. This is not all; there is more than that. The honorable gentleman will not forget that the press of the civilised world decided upon that occasion that " mercy should rule and not severity. " The opinion of the press of the whole world, the London *Lancet*, the *Christian World*, the London *Daily News*, the London *Echo*, the *Pall-Mall Gazette* in England, *Le National*, *Le Journal des Débats* and *Le Télégraphe* in France, *Harper's Weekly*, the *Times*, the *World*, the *Commercial Advertiser* of New-York, and scores of other journals in the United States, gave it as their opinion that

MERCY SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE RULE

upon that occasion. I will tell the honorable gentleman who has interrupted me that if those great organs of public opinion came to the conclusion that mercy should have been the rule upon that occasion, how dare he now contest the honesty of the people of Quebec who came to the same conclusion? If those who were without the conflict, if those who looked from a calmer sphere came to this conclusion, is it to be wondered at that the people of Quebec came to the same conclusion, though it may be regretted that they expressed their opinion in such violent language? I say more. There is no one man of English origin, if he be true to the standard of that proud race which never tolerated injustice, and never submitted to tyranny, who, looking at the long tale of woe and misery which resulted in the rebellion in the North-West, but must feel his heart indignant—not against the poor wretches who, goaded to madness and driven to despair by years of careless indifference, at last risked life and limb and freedom, risked the loss of everything dear to man, to get justice, and then alone obtained it—but against those who by their own supineness had brought about such a crime on the fair name of the country. There is more than that. If the history of that rebellion were told, it would unfold to the world

A TRAGEDY DARKER THAN HAMLET.

There was a race of men on the border between savage and civilised life; advanced enough to understand the value of property, but not advanced enough to defend their property against those unfeeling speculators who everywhere precede civilisation. Among the whole race then in Canada there was not one who had received the smallest rudiment of education; but they had heard there was one of their number who had been more favored than they in this respect, and

he was then an exile. If he were brought back to the Territories, might he not procure for them the act of simple justice which they themselves could not obtain? To him they appealed; but, misfortune greater than all their misfortune! the man to whom they thus appealed to be the eye to see for them, the mind to guide them, the arm to protect them, had been touched by the hand of God, and was the most helpless of them all. In the face of such facts, the judgment of my fellow-countrymen can be impugned, but their honesty cannot be assailed. It is a vile imputation to attack their honesty of purpose; and if I have thus alluded to these facts, it is not with a view of recrimination, it is not with a view of perpetuating the bitterness of these sad days. But since we are threatened with a war of races, since my honorable friend (Mr. McCarthy) is going to appeal to the people of Ontario to unite together, I want at least fair play in the contest. I cannot allow that such a statement as this made at Stayner should go unrebuked, and I must do my share in the attempt to re-establish perverted truth. I cannot allow the fair name of my countrymen to be assailed by false statements, and that the expression should go abroad uncontradicted that the people of Quebec will follow no law but the law of their own selfishness. Since the honorable gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has taken this attitude, since he has tried to introduce this new policy, which outlines the course he has taken recently, we might have hoped that he were impelled by

MOTIVES OF A HIGHER

and nobler consideration. I am not ignorant of the fact that, among the men who have adopted the same views as the honorable gentleman, there are many who have come to the conclusion which the honorable gentleman has given expression to, from the conviction that the existence of two separate nationalities

in Canada is not compatible with the existence of the Dominion. This objection thus presented is one which I will not reject. On the contrary, I say this is a question which must engross the serious attention of all those who have at heart the future of the country, for no one can close his eyes to the fact that the existence of two distinct nationalities must produce sometimes, as it has produced already, causes of angry friction and, therefore, of danger. But, Sir, we must deal with facts as they are, and deal with them as we find them. Here are two different races geographically united under the same political allegiance, but separated by numerous ethnical features. With those conflicting elements, it is the object of the honorable gentleman apparently—it is my own object certainly, and it is the object of us all, I believe—to try to form a nation. This is the problem we have to solve; how shall we proceed to solve it? The honorable gentleman has given as his method, the Tory method, and he has once more demonstrated that Tory methods never proceed from the nobler, higher instincts of the human heart and the human intellect, but always from the dread, the diffidence, and the distrust which everywhere has made the Tory party, wherever it has had sway, suspicious and cruel. The honorable gentleman, looking around this broad Dominion, sees a population of one and a-half million inhabitants, nearly one third of our whole population, who are of French origin, attached to their language, their laws, their institutions, and their religion—attached to everything which characterises their separate individuality. If the honorable gentleman had stated that this was a cause of possible friction, and that we should endeavor to find some means of alleviating that friction, I would agree with him; but the honorable gentleman did not take that view. On the contrary, he coldly asserts that

THE EXISTENCE OF TWO SEPARATE RACES

here is not compatible with the existence of the Domi-

nion, and, therefore, one must disappear; and I have quoted his words in which he appeals to his friends of English origin to buckle on their armor, and see to it that we have only one nationality on this continent. Sir, if this policy were to prevail, what would be the result? What is it the honorable gentleman has in view? It is simply this: that the French Canadians should feel the yoke on their shoulders, that they should be deprived by legislation, or by force if necessary, of everything which has been granted to them hitherto. If this doctrine were to prevail, on what foundation would this Confederation rest? The honorable gentleman, I am sure, would himself admit that pride of race, attachment to the memory of one's nation and ancestors, are noble sentiments; and yet the honorable gentleman coldly proposes that one and a-half million of Canadians—in order, as he says, that they should become good Canadians—should renounce their origin and the tradition of their race. He proposes that the humiliation of one whole race in this country should be the foundation of this Dominion. Woe to the party which can adopt such degrading doctrines as this! Who does not see that the humiliation of one race would be a far greater danger to Confederation than any we have ever yet known? I endorse the words spoken a short time ago by the honorable member for North Bruce (Mr. NcNeill), that we want to build up a nation on this continent; and we want to establish such a state of things that every citizen of this country, whatever his origin may be, whether he is English or French, shall feel in his heart a supreme pride to call himself a Canadian. But I would ask the honorable gentleman—I could not appeal perhaps to his heart, though I might to his logical mind—does he believe that to subject one whole section of our population to the humiliation of

RENOUNCING ITS ORIGIN,

of turning its back upon its history, would make them proud of the country? Who does not perceive

that if you should force one section to hate the institutions under which they live, those institutions cannot live? Sir, the humiliation of one race, one class, one creed, or one man is not the foundation on which this Confederation can rest. There is but one foundation for it, that is, to give the fullest scope and the fullest sway to all those sentiments which could not be torn from the heart without causing a loss of pride. The honorable gentleman seems to think that all Canadians should be cast in the same mould. He is proud of his race, and he has every reason to be proud of it; but, Sir, it does not follow that we should all be English-speaking Canadians, that we should all be merged in the Anglo-Saxon element. Certainly no one can respect or admire more than I do the Anglo-Saxon race; I have never disguised my sentiments on that point; but we of French origin are satisfied to be what we are, and we claim no more. I claim this for the race in which I was born, that though it is not perhaps endowed with the same qualities as the Anglo-Saxon race, it is endowed with qualities as great; I claim for it that it is endowed with qualities unsurpassed in some respect; I claim for it that there is not to-day under the sun a more moral, more honest or more intellectual race; and if the honorable gentleman came to Lower-Canada, it would be my pride to take him to one of those ancient parishes on the St. Lawrence or one of its tributaries, and show him a people to whom, prejudiced as he is, he could not but apply the words which the poet applied to those who at one time inhabited the Basin of Minas and the meadows of Grandpré:—

> Men whose lives glided on like rivers that water the wood;
> [land
> Darkened by shadows of earth, but reflecting an image of
> [Heaven.

Sir, I claim no more than what is fairly due to my countrymen, and I say, let

THE TWO RACES STAND TOGETHER,

each with its own characteristics; they will be all the more speedily united in the same aspirations towards a common object—British in allegiance and Canadian in sentiment. But, Sir, if you attempt to rend from one whatever is dear and sacred to it, instead of having peace and harmony, you will have ever increasing discord. My honorable friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other day told us that it was in the interest of the French Canadians to become a part of the Anglo-Saxon race; and proceeding to relate the achievements of that great race, both in war and peace, he almost asked permission from and apologised to the French Canadians for feeling proud of the British feats of arms on the Plains of Abraham, in the Bay of Trafalgar, on the field of Waterloo. Sir, my honorable friend needed not to apologise; his sentiments are quite natural to those who have the same blood as he has in his veins, and they cannot be offensive to anyone; but I, who belong to the race which was defeated in those battles, claim no permission to say that I lay no claim to that stoical heroism, if heroism it be, which can contemplate without a pang, even retrospectively, the defeat of one's own race, though my judgment is clear that in two, at least, of those battles—that on the Plains of Abraham and that on the field of Waterloo—the victory of England was a victory of liberty. I have, more than once in this House, told my fellow-countrymen of the province of Quebec, that the day which had severed Canada from France had not been an evil day for the descendants of France, because they had found under the British Crown

GREATER LIBERTY

than they could have hoped for under the French regime, and after all liberty is the greatest boon of life. But, Sir, while I say that, I do not disguise to

my fellow-countrymen of English origin, who will, I hope, understand me, that even at this day, holding the opinions which I hold, whenever I take up our history, as I follow the long, the persistent, the implacable duel between England and France for the possession of this continent; as I trace, page by page, the fatal climax, dim at first, but gradually taking shape and becoming inevitable; as I follow the brave army of Montcalm retreating before superior forces, retreating, even after victory, retreating into a circle made every day narrower and narrower; as I come to the last page and the last struggle where that truly great man, the gallant Montcalm, found death with his first defeat, I do not disguise from my fellow-countrymen of English origin that my heart is clenched and that my French blood runs colder in my veins. Talk to me not of your purely utilitarian theories! Men are not mere automatons! It is not by trampling on the tenderest sentiments of the soul that you will ever accomplish your end if such an end you have in view. And yet it is in the name of British allegiance, it is with the apparent object of securing the future of this country, that this new policy is introduced—

THIS SO CALLED BRITISH POLICY

which is at total variance with the policy ever followed by the British authorities on this continent. This country had but a few years before passed under the regime of the English Crown, when the great conflict arose between England and her colonies to the south, which ended in the separation of those colonies from the mother land. England at once realised that, if she was to retain a foothold upon this continent, it was necessary for her to win the affections of her new subjects, since she had lost the allegiance of those of her own kith and kin; and that unless she made just concessions she could not hope to do so. In a just and generous spirit she made the concessions necessary to gain this object. To her

new subjects she gave their laws, their language, and their religion, although at the time that very religion was subjected to many disabilities in England. Does not the honorable gentleman who moved this Bill know, as everybody must know, that these timely concessions saved this colony to England? Does he not know that if the new subjects of England had joined the armies which Congress sent over to force Canadians into the movement of insurrection, the result would have been for Canada what it has been for the rebellious colonies—total separation? And the honorable gentleman might have known that, though the Marquis de Lafayette and the Count d'Estaing sent their emissaries to wave the old colors of France before the eyes of the old subjects of France, the latter still remained true and fought under the British flag around the walls of Quebec

WITH THE SAME COURAGE

which they had displayed against that flag but sixteen years before. Supposing the honorable gentleman had been living then and had had a voice in the council of the King, what advice would he have given? Would he have said: Do not allow these men to talk their own language; do not give them any privileges? If he had, and if his advice had been taken, this country would not be British as it is to-day. I have stated, and I repeat the statement, that the French Canadians having claimed and received from England the privileges of British subjects, it would be the blackest ingratitude on their part if, to-day, they were to reject the obligations which British citizenship entails; but I also say to the honorable gentleman that it would be ungrateful, unmanly, and ungenerous to repeal at this moment, or to attempt to take from the French Canadians the concessions made to them to win their affections and to secure their support in the day of England's danger. The honorable member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, a few

evenings ago, that he had his doubts as to whether the loyalty of French Canadians upon that occasion had been altogether unmixed; he had his doubts as to whether, instead of being loyal, they did not only look to their language, their laws, their institutions and their church. I do not understand the doubts of the honorable gentleman. I do not doubt at all. I am quite sure these were the motives which impelled my countrymen to be loyal. They had to choose between the action of the British Crown and that of the Philadelphia Congress. The British Crown had just granted them the Act of 1774, which secured to them everything they held dear—their language, their laws and their religion—and they had to choose between that and the Act of the Philadelphia Congress, which will

ALWAYS REMAIN A BLOT

on a noble page of American history. The honorable gentleman shows that in the proclamation which the Congress of Philadelphia issued to the English people that very concession was declared to be one of the grievances of which the colonies had to complain. These were the motives that induced my countrymen to take the stand they did. Does the honorable gentleman find fault with them for being guided by motives? Do not men generally act on motives? As Mr. Lincoln said, in 1862, in the darkest period of the war: Negroes themselves will act upon motives. I would like to know what objection my honorable friend has to that. What are his views of loyalty? Does loyalty consist only in kissing the smiting hand? Is it meritorious when submissive and slavish? No; loyalty is meritorious when it proceeds from favors granted and from justice done. And this has been the invariable tradition of the race to which my honorable friend has the honor to belong, and of which he is justly proud. But there were before to-day men whose memory was short and whose sense of gratitude

was limited. In the first Parliament, which sat in 1791 under the Constitution then granted, there were men like the honorable member for Simcoe(Mr.McCarthy) and the honorable member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton),who wished to have the use of the French language abolished in the legislative hall. Their attempts were frustrated, chiefly by the efforts of one man, who upon that subject could speak with authority. That man was

JOSEPH PAPINEAU,

the illustrious father of a still more illustrious son; and his whole life was the repudiation of the theory advanced here in the last four days. He was an example of the fact that a man can speak in the language of his ancestors, and still remain a true subject of the Crown of England. At the time when Arnold and Montgomery were invading Canada, despatches had been brought from Lord Howe, who commanded the British forces in the insurgent colonies, to Sir Guy Carleton, who commanded the English forces in Canada. The despatches reached Montreal. Sir Guy Carleton had been forced to retreat to Quebec before Montgomery's army, and was busily preparing that city against the invaders. The despatches could not be carried further than Montreal, except at the cost of great perils and hardships; but two young men undertook to carry them through. Joseph Papineau, then a young man, twenty-five years of age, was one of the two who volunteered for this service. The country was in the hands of the enemy; it was unsettled, and there were great rivers to be crossed, without bridges,and it was in the fall of the year. Mr.Papineau and his friend tramped the whole distance.They reached Quebec and delivered their despatches. Then, what did they do? They enlisted as volunteers and served in the defence of Quebec, until the enemy was repulsed from Canadian soil. Some few years afterwards, in 1791, Mr. Papineau had been elected mem-

ber for Montreal, and when the attempt was made to banish the French language from the walls of the legislature of Quebec, Mr. Papineau could speak with some authority, and he asked:

> Is it simply because Canada forms part of the British Empire that Canadians, who speak not the language in use on the banks of the Thames, are to be deprived of their natural rights?

Mr. Papineau's recent services, his fidelity to the cause in danger, were such as to convince the English members of the Legislature that his arguments were reasonable and generous; and I submit that

HIS WORDS SHOULD FIND AN ECHO

even at this distant day, within the walls of this chamber. The honorable gentleman told us that, at a later date, Lord Durham, in his famous report, advised the suppression of the French language in the legislative halls of Canada. It is perfectly true, and his views were incorporated to the Imperial Act of 1840, but five years had not elapsed before the Canadian Legislature unanimously decided, all shades of opinion united, to petition the Imperial Parliament to remove the obnoxious clause, and it was so removed. The union of Upper and Lower Canada had just been consummated, and it was soon perceived, under the guidance of that master mind, Mr. Baldwin, that if the union was to be for the good of the whole people, every section of the people had to be protected in what was held dear by every one of them. This Act of the Legislature has, however, been criticised by my honorable friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He found nothing in it great, generous or statesmanlike. On the contrary, he characterised it as a weak concession from politicians in order to capture French votes. I would not do justice to the honorable gen-

tleman if I did not here quote his words. This is what he said:

> The Parliament of 1840 did all it could to repair the injury of 1774; but, gentlemen, it was not very long before our politicians undid it all.

Mark the supreme contempt in those words, "our politicians!" The honorable gentleman was on tender ground when he spoke of "politicians", he was at one time a politician, though he informed his audience that he was no longer of that class.

Mr. Mills (Bothwell) :—A statesman.

Mr. Laurier:—The honorable gentleman was too modest to say that, but he left it to be inferred, that

THE GREAT STATESMEN

of the present day should endeavor to undo the great wrong inflicted on this country, from such base motives, by such puny politicians as Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Lafontaine, Sir Allan MacNab and Mr. Morin. The honorable gentleman was proud, he said, to fortify his views with the views of Lord Durham and he was proud to refer to Lord Durham as a Liberal of the Liberals. It is true that Lord Durham was a Liberal, but I will show that, while he was a friend of liberty, and was one of the most advanced statesmen of his day, he did not know the force of free institutions, and that, however large the range of his mind, he was not such a keen-sighted statesman, nor even true Liberal, as was our own Robert Baldwin. My honorable friend the other day recalled the famous word of Lord Durham, wherein, in graphic language, he depicted the state of Lower Canada in the summer of 1838. He had expected, he said, to find here a conflict between the Government and a people, but he had found two peoples warring in the bosom of the same state; he has found a struggle, not of principles, but of races. This language is perfectly true. It cannot be doubted at

this day, that the movement which culminated in the rebellion of 1837-38 in Lower-Canada, when it assumed that acute form, had degenerated into a war of races. My honorable friend did not tell us the cause which had brought about that war of races, but Lord Durham told us, and my honorable friend might have quoted his language. The cause was the contest between the Legislative Assembly and an irresponsible Government. For almost fifty years the Legislative Assembly passed laws which were deemed essential, absolutely essential, for the welfare of the country, and even for the very existence of the Legislative Assembly itself, as a body; and as often as those laws were passed, so often were they trampled upon

BY AN IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

The Assembly was altogether French; the Executive was almost entirely English, and its members were recruited by the Colonial Office among its creatures. As may be expected in any such case, the whole French population took part with the Assembly, and nearly the whole of the English population took part with the Executive. Very few, probably, thought much as to who was in the right or as to who was in the wrong: but if you desire to know who was in the main right in that dispute, I cannot do better than to call in the testimony of Lord Durham himself, as it is couched in his report. And this is what he said:

> From the commencement, therefore, to the end of the disputes which marked the whole parliamentary history of Lower Canada, I look on the conduct of the Assembly as a constant warfare with the Executive, for the purpose of obtaining the powers inherent in a representative body by the very nature of representative government.

Thus you have the admission that, if there was a rebellion, it was forced upon the French Canadians of that day by the action of the Executive government,

which had refused to give the Legislative Assembly the powers inherent to a legislative body. Yet, in face of that opinion, Lord Durham said that the loyalty of the French Canadians could not be trusted, and that henceforth Lower Canada would have to be governed by an English population, and the method he suggested was the union of the two Canadas, with a provision that the English population should have in the House a large majority in members. The reason he gives for coming to that conclusion is given in very pithy terms. Here it is:

> Never again will the present generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to a British government.

I have already stated that Lord Durham did not know the full force of free representative institutions, and that our own Baldwin was a greater statesman in that respect than Lord Durham. Lord Durham had not imagined, he had not thought, that, if the French Canadians were given all their privileges, they would at once become loyal subjects, that they would not have to be governed by the strong hand of an English majority, that division would not take place on the line of races, but on the broader lines which impel men to move onward or to cling to the past. Mr. Baldwin understood that, and he was the first to suggest that the French Canadians should have their language restored, and should be treated as the equals of their fellow-citizens of English origin. That was true statesmanship and that view was unanimously adopted by the Legislature; and I ask, in face of subsequent facts,

WHO IS THE GREATER STATESMAN,

Lord Durham or Mr. Baldwin? Lord Durham stated that the then living generation of French Canadians would never yield submission to an English Government. At that very time, there was a young man who was

an exile from his native country, because he had been a few months before a rebel in arms, and the British government had set a price upon his head. There is no doubt that, if he had been captured, he would have met the fate of those who, on the scaffold, paid the penalty of having loved their country not wisely, but too well. Under the policy introduced in 1845, this young man became a member of Parliament and leader of the Conservative party, and he died a baronet of the realm. Sir, this took place in face of the words Lord Durham wrote in 1838, when he said that never again would that generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to the British government. Now, my honorable friend for Simcoe asks us to go back upon this policy. Are we to be told at this day, or is it to be believed by any one at this day, that the policy introduced by Mr. Baldwin has not made Canada what it is? Is their a man living in this land, especially if he is of the Liberal party, who would at this day

GO BACK UPON THE POLICY

inaugurated by their leader forty years ago? Sir, there is not a man in this country to-day who must not feel proud of the wise and statesmanlike policy which was introduced upon that occasion. I am not ignorant of, nor will I minimize, the danger which arises to Canada from the fact that we have here a duality of language and a duality of race. But the fact exists, and ostracism of any kind, instead of removing the danger, would simply intensify it, by forcing a section of our population to hate the institutions under which they live—intensify it, because it would bring a section of our population into conflict with the majority, which would thus abuse the brute power of number. It seems to me that the honorable gentleman must feel that the policy he is now championing is weak and inferior. Any policy which appeals to a class, to a creed, to a race, or which does

not appeal to the better instincts to be found in all classes, in all creeds, and in all races, is stamped with the stamp of inferiority. The French Canadian who appeals to his fellow-countrymen to stand by themselves, aloof from the rest of this continent; the English Canadian who, like my honorable friend, appeals to his fellow-countrymen on grounds affecting them alone, may, perhaps, win the applause of those whom they may be addressing, but impartial history will pronounce their work as vicious in conception as it is mischievous and wicked in its tendency. We are here a nation, or

WE WANT TO BE A NATION,

composed of the most heterogeneous elements—Protestants and Catholics, English, French, German, Irish, Scotch, every one, let it be remembered, with his traditions, with his prejudices. In each of these conflicting antagonistic elements, however, there is a common spot of patriotism, and the only true policy is that which reaches that common patriotism and makes it vibrate in all, towards a common end and common aspirations. I may be asked: What, then, is to be the future of Canada? The future of Canada is this: that it must be British. I do not share the dreams or the delusions of those few of my fellow-countrymen of French origin, who talk to us of forming a French nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence; and I would say to my honorable friend from Simcoe, if he were here, than these dreams ought not to disturb his sleep. Those who share these delusions are very few; they might be counted upon the fingers of one hand, and I never knew but one newspaper which ever gave them utterance. Yet, while I say that this country is bound to be British, it does not follow at all that there must be but one language—the English language—to be spoken in this country. I claim that I am as loyal as the honorable gentleman to the institutions of this country, and I am the son of a French

mother, and I declare that I cling to the language which I learned at her knee as I cling to the life which she gave me. And upon this ground I appeal to every man of British origin, to every man of that race in which the domestic affections are so strong; and I know that in the heart of every one the answer will be that, situated as we are,

THEY WOULD DO AS WE DO.

But the honorable gentleman will revert to the cold, dry argument, that after all, a dualty of race will produce friction and that friction will produce danger. But where is the remedy? I tell the honorable gentleman that the remedy is not in ostracism, not in harsh methods nor in cruel methods. My honorable friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)—who, like many other good men, preaches better than he practices—gave us the other day the true remedy. The true remedy, he said, is mutual forbearance and respect. I altogether agree with my honorable friend from North Bruce. But he complained in his speech that the forbearance should not be all on one side. Sir, is it all on one side? What he complains of is a few expressions, I admit very imprudent, that have fallen from the lips of some men in the heat of the debate. Well, I am pretty sure that when those expressions are sifted and explained, they readily fall away. The newspapers of Ontario, during the past year, have been full of citations of the words of my honorable friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), pronounced at the St. Jean Baptiste celebration last year; and when he took occasion, a few days ago, to explain those words, he explained them so thoroughly that my honorable friend from North Bruce immediately wanted to make him a member of the Imperial Federation League. If all the other expressions were so sifted, I do not despair that my honorable friend from North Bruce would try to make Mr. Mercier himself a member of the Imperial Federation League. This is what he

claims his fellow-countrymen and my fellow-countrymen of English origin have to bear. Well, I tell him that the French Canadians have also something to bear. What we object to is the meddlesome interference of certain men in Ontario in our domestic politics; what I object to is the whining pity bestowed by some over-zealous and over-good men in Ontario upon the poor, down-trodden, prostrate French Canadians. Only the other day my honorable friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) complained that the Province of Quebec was making no progress, and he instanced the fact that in that Province we still have

THE TITHING SYSTEM,

and he said if there was in Quebec a true Liberal party, they would grapple with such an evil as that. There is in Quebec a Liberal party, not without fault, I admit, but a party which has fought as noble a battle as was ever fought by any party in any land. But before I tell him why the Liberal party in Quebec do not grapple with the tithing system, let me remind him that there is in England a Liberal party of which any man ought to be proud. a party led to-day by one of the greatest men that England has ever produced, or that any land has ever produced—Mr. Gladstone. Does my honorable friend also know that there is a tithing system in England just as there is a tithing system in Lower Canada—no, not just the same, because the tithing system in England is far more oppressive and unjust than the system in Lower Canada. The tithing system in Lower Canada only affects Roman Catholics and no one else, but in England the tithing system affects every man, whether he is a member of the Church of England or of another. And yet never to this day did the Liberal party grapple with that system or attempt to bring the English people to abolish that system. Why? Because the great majority of the English people would not

part with it. And for the very same reason the Liberal party has never grappled with that system here, because the people of Quebec are satisfied with it. My honorable friend has read somewhere that the people are oppressed under the tithing system, that they are compelled to abandon their lands because the oppression is such that they cannot pay the tithes. The truth is the people of Quebec to-day

GIVE DOUBLE THE AMOUNT

to the Church voluntarily than they give by law. I declare, in the name of the Liberal party of Quebec, of which I am an humble member, that so long as the conscience of Quebec is satisfied with the system never will the Liberal party attack that system. I will say this to the honorable member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that if we could make a compact between the English and the French, each to mind his own business and not meddle with the business of the other, we would get along tolerably well, not only tolerably well, but perfectly well. Yet the honorable member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) perhaps may say: If you are to bring the two races together, simply by relying upon moral influence and persuasion, the union may be far away. There is force in the objection, because there are in Quebec, as there are in Ontario, extreme men who will not be amenable either to reason or generous considerations. The extreme men of Quebec talk to-day of forming a French nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and the extremists of Ontario talk of driving away the French with bayonets. When the very large body of the nation, composed of the two races, come closer together and know each other better, I have no doubt that friction of races here will be as rare as it is in Switzerland after hundreds of years of political union. The honorable member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) if he were here, would say, perhaps: Is this system ever to remain? Is there

never to be a day when we shall have here nothing but the English language? I would tell my honorable friend that I do not trouble myself with such considerations as to a dim and distant future. The only thing which troubles me at this moment is, to keep peace and harmony in this land, and not have peace and harmony endangered under the vain pretence of securing the future against feuds and contentions. I would have great pleasure in telling the hon. gentleman—and I am sorry he is not present—that, in my judgment, the English language is to-day and must be for several generations, perhaps for several centuries,

THE COMMANDING LANGUAGE

of the world. So long as the centre of civilization was on the basin of the Mediterranean, three languages in succession held sway: the Greek, the Latin and the French. At the end of the seventeenth century the French language was undoubtedly the dominating language of civilization. It is still the language of diplomacy, the vehicle of communication for international exchange in the higher productions of the human mind, but it is no longer the language of the many. That position now belongs to the English language. That revolution has been accomplished by the wonderful development of the Anglo-Saxon race during the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries. That race have carried their language with them in their emigration around the world, and now it is the language of more than 100,000,000 of people scattered over Europe, Africa, America, Asia, and the islands and continents of the Pacific Ocean. Sir, the very fact that the English language is to-day the dominating language of this continent of America, makes it imperative on French Canadians, although they will retain their language, to learn and speak English. Nothing was more appropriate, more wise than the words that fell a few days ago from the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard). The

French Canadian father who to-day does not give an English education to his son does not do justice to his child, because he compels him to stand back in the hard struggle for life. I would say more. It is imperative for us French Canadians to learn English, but—I have no right to give advice to any other man —if I were to give any advice to my Anglo-Canadian friends, it would be that they would do well

TO LEARN FRENCH TOO.

The English are a proud race; but the Romans were a proud race also; and after they had conquered the world, a Roman acknowledged that the education of his son was not complete unless he was as familiar with Greek letters as he was with Latin letters. Perhaps, however, my honorable friend for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would not admit such an example for himself or the people of this country, because the object of my honorable friend is not simply to remove the use of the French language in the North-West Territories and from every legislative hall in Canada, but his object is to prevent the teaching of French in the schools of Ontario. There are to-day, in the back townships and new concessions in Ontario, schools where a few French settlers are attempting to impart some knowledge to their children in the language of their ancestors. The eagle eye of my honorable friend has caught sight of that fact. The eye of the eagle can withstand the sun, but the eye of my honorable friend cannot withstand that little light. He spoke a few days ago in this city, the Capital of Canada, at a meeting which adopted the following resolution:—

And this meeting avails itself of this opportunity of expressing the opinion that in our own province the use of the French language as the language of instruction in the public schools should be abolished and for ever prohibited, and that no undecided measure for obtaining this end will be satisfactory to the people of Ontario.

The honorable gentleman spoke to that resolution and endorsed every word of it. This is what he said:—

At the same time, as a citizen of Ontario—of the Dominion, I heartily endorse the sentiment which the meeting has given utterance to—that we ought, and ought at once and for all time, to put an end to the teaching of our children, either French Canadian or English, in any other language than the language of the country in which we live.

Is this really the measure of my honorable friend? We always knew him to be a restrictionist, but not to that extent, I am sure; we always knew him to be a restrictionist in trade, but he is

A RESTRICTIONIST EVEN IN KNOWLEDGE.

If the honorable gentleman, on that occasion, had said that the people of Ontario would insist that English should be taught in all their schools, I would raise both my hands in favor of it. But that is not enough; not only must English be taught, but he objects to any other language being taught in Ontario schools. Can it be that an honorable gentleman possessing the attainment, power and ability of my honorable friend should stoop to things so low? It is a thing low, and vile, and contemptible, to say that the people of Ontario, whatever be their creed or their origin, shall not have the right to teach a second language to their children if they choose. Men are not usually wantonly cruel; men do not, as a rule, purposely degrade their lives, and what is the reason, I want to know, which impels my honorable friend to use such language as that? Sir, the reason is, that Tories of the stamp of my honorable friend never can bring themselves up to the point of trusting the better instincts of the human heart; they never can divest themselves of the base notion that, if they treat their opponents with generosity or with justice, their opponents will abuse the privilege. They can never divest

themselves of the base notion that, if the French Canadians are to be allowed their language and their characteristics as a race, they will turn traitors as a race. They want to make this country British in the same manner they have tried

TO MAKE IRELAND BRITISH.

For the last seven hundred years, English statesmen have attempted to make Ireland British, not by justice, not by generosity, not by appealing to the better instincts of the generous hearts of that people, but by every form of violence and cruelty. They have proscribed her religion, they have killed her agriculture, they have destroyed her commerce, they have done everything to degrade the land and the people. And with what result? With the result of making Ireland a thorn in the side of England, with the result of filling the heart of the people of Ireland with bitterness against England. Sir, Mr. Gladstone has done more in five years to make Ireland British than English statesmen have done for seven hundred years before. Will I show you the different results which can be wrought upon the feelings of a sensitive people by generous treatment? Let me quote a speech delivered by Mr. John Dillon, M. P. for Tipperary, last year. The occasion was a demonstration in favor of Mr. Dillon on his being released from jail, where he had served a term under the odious Coercion law. Now, I cite the speech because it may be a lesson to the honorable member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and those who agree with him in this House. Mr. Dillon said :—

But it is impossible for me to be blind to the facts that are forced upon my notice as regard the mighty change which have come over the minds of the masses of the people of England, and remembering this, I think it is not wise to be impatient, because the liberty of Ireland is not to be accomplished in a day. I can see no cause for impatience, but cause rather for hope and even exultation. Coming now, as I do,

from what was meant to be a degradation and an insult to me, and as I hope an honorable man, I can find in my heart not the slightest trace of bitterness against the people of England. I recollect the day when the power and when the name of Englishmen were hateful to my heart. It may be that I have been demoralized by the countless acts of kindness I have received at the hands of Englishmen; but the feeling has now changed, and I cannot find it in my heart to regret that it is fast passing away.

Those last words, I am sure, will fill with unbounded joy the friends of Ireland and the friends of England as well. But

WITH WHAT TERRIBLE MEANING

are not these words prefaced! It is known that Mr. Dillon is a man of noble and unstained character. No harsh words would be expected to cross the lips of such a man, yet he tells us there was a time when the very name of England was hateful to him. How terrible these words are! They are the expression of the bitterness accumulated through centuries and centuries of persecutions in succeeding generations of Irishmen. But, Sir, mark the change. Less than five years of a generous attempt by a great party to do justice to Ireland, to give her the liberty and justice to which she is entitled, has worked wonders and changed the disposition of the Irish people. These five years of generous attempts to do justice to Ireland have erased the sentiment of bitterness and replaced it by sentiments of affection to the land whose very name was hateful to Ireland only a few years ago. What a triumph this is for the cause of Ireland! What a triumph this is for those who, in this House, told the English people that if they were to treat the Irish people generously, they would have the same result in Ireland as in this country! What an evidence also this is that the only manner, after all, in which you can attach a people to their allegiance is to treat them with fairness and generosity; and what a rebuke

it is to all those (my honorable friend from North Simcoe included) who believe that the only manner in which to make a people loyal is to trample under foot everything which they hold dear and sacred. Sir, I have just pronounced

THE NAME OF HOME RULE.

Home Rule with us is local autonomy, and I hope that this principle of local autonomy will some day afford us some solution of the difficulty we have now to deal with. What is objectionable in this Bill is not, as has been often stated, the object of the Bill itself, (which is, after all, with some exceptions, a local question), but the tendency of the Bill and the principles which underlie it, for we know that this is only a preliminary step that is to be followed by many others. We are, to-day, in the fourth day of this debate, and I have to make the reproach that the Government have not yet told us what their policy is on the question. The Government, of late, do not discharge the duty they owe to this House. They can advise us on matters of details and matters of procedure, but when it comes to a question of principle they refuse to discharge the duties for which they are responsible to the House. We had a speech the other day from the honorable the Minister of Public Works. He simply told us he was against the Bill, but he affirmed no principle which we might apply to the situation. We have three propositions before us: the Bill itself, the amendment of my honorable friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the amendment of my honorable friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). I am free to speak of them, but in what I say I declare that I express my own personal opinion. I do not speak here as the leader of a party —I express my own opinion, and nothing more. As to the amendment of the honorable member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I have to say that, in my opinion, it is premature. It is endeavoring to give to the

people of the Territories upon one question, plenary power, while they are still

IN A FORM OF TUTELAGE.

We are not prepared to give to the people of the North-West full local autonomy. We cannot expect that a population which in 1885 numbered only something like 30,000 souls—the population of a small town, scattered over immense territories, out of which several empires can be carved—can be entrusted with the full power of responsible government. The amendment of my honorable friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) is, perhaps, more consistent with our true position. The amendment affirms the proposition that the present state of things ought to be permanent. With this, however, I cannot agree, and although I am prepared to vote for the amendment of my honorable friend from Berthier, I cannot do so without taking exception to his statements. It is impossible to admit, for instance, that the institutions of the North-West are permanent. On the contrary, they are exceptionally temporary: they deal with a state of things which is exceptional in itself: they were devised at a time when there was no population, and they must be modified from time to time as the necessities of the case require. But at this moment to say they are permanent, is a thing in which I cannot agree, except so far as they must be permanent in every particular, so long as we are not ready to give these people a more extended form of local authority. My honorable friend also says in this amendment, that since we passed this law and gave this incipient constitution to the North-West territories, nothing has occured to change our views. I cannot agree with that. Everything has occured since that time, not to change our views, but to set us thinking about what we should do at a future time, not very far off, in regard to those Territories. What has occured is this: a population has gone into those Territories; they

have been given a Legislature, and that Legislature has demanded certain measures—not only on the question of language, but on that of the schools, and on the system of Government. Bearing these facts in mind, it seems to me that the proper time to deal with this question will be when we are prepared to give the Territories, perhaps not absolute, but a more extended form of

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT;

and when that time comes, we must be prepared to deal with this question upon the broad principle of this constitution, which has been devised for the safety of the majority and the protection of the minority, and in the light of the condition of things which may exist at that time in the Territories. But till then I believe it is better to defer the consideration of this question. There is this remarkable feature in the Bill we have before us: it is not founded on an expression of the will of the people of the Territories; it is founded simply on alleged principles applicable to the whole Dominion. This is what I object to in this Bill, and—though it is my own individual opinion only—I submit to all parties in this House, French or English, Liberals or Conservatives, that the best thing for us to do is to defer the consideration of this question to a future time when we shall be prepared to deal with all the questions now affecting the North-West Territories. In the meantime, however, we ought to remember this—French, English, Liberals, Conservatives—that no race in this country has absotute rights, only the rights which do not invade the rights of any other race. We ought to remember that the expression of race feelings and race sentiments should be well restrained to a point, beyond which, if pressed, though still kept within legitimate limits, they might hurt the feelings and sentiments of other races. But when the time comes for dealing with this question, I hope we shall all be prepared, without party differences, to deal with it

ON THE BROAD PRINCIPLES

that apply to this Constitution; that we shall not, French or English, hesitate to apply true principles under the fear that evil consequences may flow from them, because we must remember that true principles are only an emanation of Divine truth, and that there is above us an eternal Providence whose infinite wisdom knows better than man what is best for man, and who, even when all seems lost, still guides everything for the greatest good.

TRIUMPH OF PROVINCIAL RIGHTS

CELEBRATION OF THE PROVINCIAL VICTORIES OF 1890

SPEECH AT THE CLUB NATIONAL BANQUET, MONTRÉAL, ON THE 2nd JULY, 1890

The vindication of Provincial rights, emphasized by the sweeping Liberal victories at the general elections of 1890 in the four principal provinces of Confederation—in New-Brunswick on the 20th January, in Nova Scotia on the 21st May, in Ontario on the 5th June, and, last but not least, in Quebec on the 17th June, the Mercier National Government in the last named province being returned to power by the overwhelming vote of the people—was fittingly commemorated by a great banquet given by the Club National at Montreal on the 2nd July, to which the victorious Premiers of the different provinces and the principal members of the party, both Federal and Provincial, were invited. The festivity was a remarkable success and among the prominent speakers on the occasion was the leader of the Federal Opposition, Honorable Wilfrid Laurier, who replied to the toast of "Canada" and to whose utterance *L'Electeur* of Quebec referred in the following strain in its issue of the 5th July :

"The address of the leader of the Federal Opposition will be read with the same enthusiasm with which it was greeted by the guests at the banquet. It will be especially read with profit and advantage by all the citizens of this country, no matter to what party, race or creed they may belong. How many prejudices, false impressions and misunderstandings will be dissipated by this noble language !

"It is well that Mr. Laurier's voice should thus be raised from time to time in this country, as his words are like a powerful wind which drives before it the clouds that fanaticism accumulates over our heads. His eloquence is eminently pacificatory, and we trust to have another calm of a few weeks after his last declarations.

"In what magnificent language he lays down the great principles of justice and equality which animate his party ! How his high-minded way of presenting things towers above the clamors and yells of fanaticism ! What is chiefly to be admired in the Liberal leader is the unity, the stability, the unswerving rectitude of his ideas, the mark of profound con-

victions. As remarked by a commentator on his speeches in a volume recently published, "his eloquence is an endless variation on a single theme"; his work is a system, as his method is a synthesis; all his speeches hang together; they are like the chapters of a same book or the periods of a demonstration.

"Our hope is that this last address may be translated into English and read in all the provinces. This is all we ask in the interest of general harmony."

(Translation)

MR. PRESIDENT
AND GENTLEMEN,

In the first place, I must congratulate the Club National on the happy inspiration which suggested the placing of this demonstration under the patronage of the Prime Ministers of the four provinces, which were the original parties to and still hold the foremost rank in Confederation. It should be congratulated, I say, because the idea was really an inspiration. It happens—and the fact is one of good omen for our country—that the Governments of those four provinces are at this moment in the hands of men, who, apart from some shades of opinion, belong to the same political way of thinking, who, in the course of the year, appealed to the electorate of their respective provinces, and who came out of the struggle stronger than they went into it, thus showing that the opinions, of which they are the champions, are now more generally spread, more deeply anchored in the hearts of the populations which they represent than at any time in their past history.

Gentlemen, the names which we see emblazoned here—Mowat, Mercier, Blair and Fielding,—names which you greet with enthusiasm every time they are mentioned—remind us that there is a community between the provinces of Confederation, that there is a community of sentiment between the races inhabiting them, and that, if there are amongst us differences of origin and divergencies of opinion, the boundaries

of our country are, after all, not confined to the boundaries of our provinces.

The soil of our country is co-extensive with the soil of Canada and, if we are separated on many points, still we form only one nation.

We have the pleasure of seeing to-day at this table the one who appealed last to the electorate of his province, our friend, Mr. Mercier, and we can tender our congratulations to him personally. We do not enjoy the same privilege as regards Messrs. Mowat, Fielding and Blair, as they were unable to give us the honor of their presence. But, gentlemen, I use no metaphor when I say that, if they are not with us, their principles and ideas are with us and fill this hall.

I use no metaphor in saying this, for, I appeal to you, if we do not cherish in our hearts the principles which they defend.

Those principles constitute the apanage, the patrimony, so to say, of all who, under any name, form part of the Liberal Opposition in the House of Commons.

I would certainly have been delighted to review, with them, the history of the four victories obtained in the four provinces to which I have just referred. This, however, would carry me too far. But I cannot resist the temptation to mention one, but not our own, as we are at home.

Gentlemen, I appeal to you all if it is not true that, on the night of the 5th June last, when the telegraph was bringing us the news of the battle which had been fought in the province of Ontario, when each despatch announced a fresh victory, the joy and the enthusiasm of the Liberals of that province could not have exceeded the joy and enthusiasm of the Liberals of the province of Quebec.

Yes, gentlemen, Mr. Mowat's victory in Ontario was not only the triumph of the Liberal cause in Ontario, but the triumph of the Liberal cause in the *entire* Dominion of Canada. It was the triumph of

the only principles on which Confederation can safely rest. It was alike the triumph of the autonomy of the provinces and of the unity of Canada.

Once more, then, let us congratulate the officers of the Club National on the happy inspiration which has furnished another opportunity to affirm that our party recognizes Canada in its entirety as our country! This is the best way to refute the slander which is being constantly reiterated by the press of another province.

It is needless to say that this affirmation would be uncalled for, if we were treated with the simplest justice by our adversaries; but, under existing circumstances, far from being useless, it is exceedingly well-timed, for, at the present hour, a powerful organization, which even Mr. Mowat has had to contend against, asserts that the French Canadians are the enemies of the constitution, that they want to isolate themselves and have nothing to do with the other races.

By inviting Messrs. Mowat, Blair and Fielding, as you have done, you refute this slander; you show that their provinces are our country as our province is theirs, and that their fellow-countrymen are our fellow-countrymen. You affirm further that, if they have their aspirations and their traditions, as we have ours, we have together the same idea, that is to say, the moral, intellectual advancement of our common country, Canada.

Nevertheless, to-morrow—not later than to-morrow—the Conservative or rather the Tory press, seizing for the hundredth time, perhaps, on some isolated words uttered by men without authority, will repeat and repeat that the French Canadians want to isolate themselves, to break up Confederation, and to erect upon its ruins a number of insignificant little principalities, each living separately like so many oysters within their shells.

You have disposed of this calumny, but it will be repeated in spite of the most authoritative denials. It will be repeated in spite of the denials of those who

have the right to speak, because, at the present time, these slanders constitute the poisoned weapon with which the Tory party, in another province. hope to injure the Liberal party. These slanders have been repeated by all the Tory politicians, big and little, from the top to the bottom of the ladder. They have been repeated against Mr. Mowat in the contest through which he has just gone in Ontario, and they will be repeated against us at the first opportunity.

You have protested against these slanders And I myself have been obliged on another occasion and under other circumstances to protest against them. Not later than last session, on the floor of the House of Commons, I reminded those who did me the honor of listening to me that, in all the struggles of our ancestors against the government of the mother country, they never asked for more than one thing, for more than one privilege: that of being treated as English subjects.

I stated that, if our ancestors demanded this privilege, it was for their descendants to accept its duties.

I recalled that there never had been but one paper amongst us which had called for the erection of a French republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and I might add to-day that, during the last elections, that paper did not support Mr. Mercier.

When I say that I am not one of those who wish for the separation of the Confederation and favor the creation of little principalities in our midst, I do not mean to say that we should always remain a colony.

On the contrary. the day is coming when this country will have to take its place among the nations of the earth.

But I do not want to see my country's independence attained through the hostility of one race to the others. I do not want my country's independence to be conceived in the blood of civil war. I want my country's independence to be reached through the normal and regular progress of all the elements of its population towards the realization of a common aspiration.

We, of French origin, have the sentiment of our own individuality. We want to hand down to our children the language we received from our forefathers. But, while cherishing this feeling in our hearts, we do not admit that it is incompatible with our title of Canadians.

We are citizens of Canada and intend to fulfil all the duties which that title involves.

But, at the same time, the moment we invite to our table men of another race like Mr. Mowat, Mr. Fielding and Mr. Blair, we affirm that we acknowledge them as our fellow-countrymen as they acknowledge that we are theirs. Their country is our country. Their political views are our political views. What they want, we want. What they want and what we want is that the rights of the minorities should be respected, that the constitutional guarantees be safeguarded, the provinces sovereign in their authority, and Canada united in its diversity.

Such, from my point of view, gentlemen, are the only theories on which the existence of the Canadian Confederation can be maintained. Unfortunately, these theories have been forgotten. Forgotten! They have been wilfully and systematically violated by the Ottawa Government, and a condition of things has resulted; which is not without danger.

It is not my habit, when the occasion arises, t shut my eyes to an actual danger.

See what is happening all around us; remark the attitude of a certain portion of the press, and I think we shall be compelled to admit to ourselves that the present situation is not without room for alarm, considering the uneasy feeling, the constraint, the distrust existing between the British elements and the French race.

The cause of this misfortune is to be found in the first place in the tendency of the Ottawa Government to encroach upon the rights of the provinces.

In all the phases of its existence, the Liberal party has protested against this fatal tendency and

policy, and I am happy to say that in our province the Conservatives who have had the courage of their opinions have joined their efforts to those of the Liberal party on this head. While on the subject, allow me to recall the long, stubborn and determined struggle maintained by a man who is unfortunately now no more, whose death was, perhaps, accelerated by it, and who has carried with him to the grave the admiration of all who appreciate deep convictions: Senator Trudel.

The attitude of the Conservatives of Mr. Trudel's school was attributed at the time to the narrowest motives, to the most intolerant conception of race exclusivism. Now,the truth was that Mr. Trudel was defending the federative principle on which Confederation rests. The truth is that, even were the people of this country homogeneous, the federative principle, the principle of the division of legislative powers, would be a necessity here as it is a necessity in the United States, where it has never been called in question.

There is no other means of working our system of government; still our adversaries have trampled it under foot, not caring whether or not in this respect they imperilled the institutions of Confederation.

Mr. Mowat is not with us to-night; but, if he was, I would show you the most stubborn champion of Provincial rights.

Mr. Mowat is not of our race. He is one of the fathers of Confederation. His devotion to the constitution is well known, and his motives cannot consequently be suspected. But, because we are of French origin, when we defend the same principles as Mr. Mowat, our adversaries have no hesitation in throwing into our faces the insulting reproach that we are actuated by petty jealousies of race, though we are in reality defending the true principles which form the groundwork of Confederation.

The uneasiness to which I have referred was further aggravated by painful circumstances and

especially by the agitation which followed the rebellion in the North West and the execution of Louis Riel.

When I allude to those unhappy days, fortunately now passed away, it is not with any desire to re-open wounds which are hardly yet healed, but I owe it to the cause of truth to reestablish the facts. I owe it to the cause of truth to say that the charges made against us on this head by the Tory press of Ontario are groundless, and that, if we took the attitude we did on the Riel question, it was not from any race feeling, as is asserted, but simply because in our opinion the Government had no right to punish a crime which it had itself provoked.

And if the Half-breeds revolted, it was not Riel's fault, but the fault of Sir John Macdonald's Government which, for years, had refused to listen to their legitimate complaints and which hastened to listen to them when they were formulated by the complainants with arms in their hands.

Nevertheless, in spite of all this, the Tory press asserts—and a man of the eminence of Mr. McCarthy has also dared to assert—that, in that agitation, the French Canadians were actuated by an unworthy sentiment, that, if they demanded Louis Riel's pardon, it was not because they believed him to be innocent, but simply because he belonged to their race, and that, every time one of their race committed a crime entailing the death penalty, they would endeavor to prevent the law from taking its course.

I consider it a task unworthy of ourselves to refute such charges. On the contrary, I assert that the agitation, which took place, had its origin and basis in the instinct of real Liberal principles.

It may be said, perhaps: If the agitation was founded on Liberal principles only, why did it not extend to the other provinces? The reason is very simple. There is an English proverb which says: "Blood is thicker than water." On that occasion, it was the voice of blood which spoke and which

breathed life, sentiment, and emotion into the cold abstraction of a principle.

All men resent injustice, but the feeling becomes more intense when that injustice comes home to us. It was because we felt ourselves assailed that so much warmth was thrown into that agitation.

These are some of the charges made against us. A war of race is being waged upon us on the pretext that we ourselves are waging a race war. We are also attacked by our adversaries in the name of Liberal principles. It is astonishing how Liberal our adversaries have grown within a few years. In the province of Ontario, the principal charge which Mr. Mowat had to fight was the charge of not being Liberal enough, and,if you will run your eye through the Conservative press of Ontario, you will find that all the attacks directed against Mr. Mowat and his friends are on the ground that they are only Liberals in name and that in reality they are under the tutelage and domination of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

These attacks are not merely intended for the Liberals of Ontario, but for the Liberals of the whole country.

I have but one remark to make on this head and I speak at this moment in the name of my authority as leader of the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada—the Liberal party will not yield any more to the clamors of extreme Protestants than it has heretofore yielded to the clamors of extreme Catholics.

Gentleman, I do not desire to reproach anyone, as I respect all convictions, but you will remember that only a few years ago and, during many long years, we had in this province what I might term a religious war. Even our name of Liberals was made a reproach to us by ultra-Catholics. During long years, Liberalism was represented as a heresy. During long years, we had to struggle to maintain the freedom of the electorate and to secure the elector's right to vote without intimidation and without undue influence.

We carried on that struggle both on the civil and on the religious ground, and won a victory on both. And now, in the province of Ontario, we have to sustain a fight of an altogether opposite character. In that province, our assailants are the extreme Protestants. The extreme Catholics blamed us for being too Liberal and the extreme Protestants now blame us for not being Liberal enough, their chief objection to us being that we will not destroy established institutions and that we want the convictions of minorities to be protected.

I repeat that the Liberal party will no more yield to the clamors of the one than to the clamors of the other and is not prepared to revive here the old quarrels and disputes of Europe.

The Liberal party will not recede in tow of the Liberals of continental Europe; it will belong to its time and its country.

The Liberal principles, as we understand and defend them, do not apply only to one province, one class, one race or one belief, but to all the provinces, all classes, all races and all beliefs.

Gentlemen, I once more propose the toast of "Canada."

Let us resolve that never shall we introduce into this country the disputes and quarrels which have drenched Europe in blood; that in this country order and freedom shall forever reign; that all the races shall dwell together in harmony and peace; and that the rights of the strong shall weigh no more in the balance with us than the rights of the weak!

From this moment, let us also resolve to organize so that, on the day which is not now far off and of which I already see the dawning, the cause which has just triumphed in Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, may also triumph throughout the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

THE END.

CONSULTING INDEX

CONSERVATIVE PARTY :

Hostile to responsible government 83
Policy based on venality 144, 363, 421
Tory Loyalty 276, 373
Tories and Ultramontanes 554
Tory double game 495, 538, 575, 617

DISALLOWANCE :

The American system 369
The Manitoba incident, ...364, 370
The Imperial Government and the right of veto, ... 372
How it is abused 367
The streams' bill 499

DUAL REPRESENTATION :

Incompatible with the freedom of the elector 13
Incompatible with the federative principle 15

DUALITY OF LANGUAGES :

Must the French language disappear? 309, 541
Preponderance of the English language 191, 600
Insults and threats of Mr. McCarthy 572, 577, 583
French in the North-West 606
The French in Ontario 496, 601

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE :

Freedom of the suffrage 7
A fixed idea of Sir John's 193
Matter within the jurisdiction of the Local powers 195,201
The franchise in the United States, our model on this head 203
Women suffrage 207
Usurpation of popular rights 208
A measure uncalled for 194, 20
Diversity of Franchise 198, 202, 205

FISHERIES, AFFAIR OF THE:

Vexatious proceedings towards American fishermen 464, 490
The *modus vivendi* 470, 490, 500
Proposals at the Washington Conference 415, 483

HOME RULE 339, 605

IMPERIAL FEDERATION 562

JESUIT'S ESTATES:

Confiscation of these estates 504
Intervention of the Pope 545
Charges made against the Jesuits 516
Expulsion of the Jesuits 518
Settlement tried by Mr. Mercier's Conservative predecessors 506, 544
Settlement approved by the Protestants of Quebec 508
Jesuits as pioneers in this country 517
Equal Rights Association 547

LETELLIER AFFAIR:

Federal Jurisdiction disputed 85
Letellier calumniated by his ex-advisers 98
Letellier protected by Ministerial responsibility 101
A high authority 104
His act covered by popular sanction 105

LIBERALISM:

Is it a new form of evil? 54
Distinction between the Conservative idea and the Liberal idea 56
Superiority of the Liberal principles 61
History of the Liberal party in this country 67
English and Continental Liberalism 67, 73, 536, 549
The priest's political rights 75
Where the right of interference in politics ends 76

LIBERAL PARTY:
Its programme 78
Nothing revolutionary in it 82
The youth and the Liberal party 143
Equal justice, equal rights 528
Alliance with the National Conservatives 554, 615
English Liberals our models 63, 67, 82, 521, 552
Reform struggles 443

LIBERTY:
Conciliation of the rights of the people and the rights of society 11
Definition of true liberty 73
The struggles of liberty 275, 307
False conception of liberty 548
Liberty of opinions 553
Freedom the best way to govern men 343
Justifiable rebellions 275, 312, 338, 346

NORTH-WEST REBELLION:
Events of 1869-70 221
The Mackenzie Government and the Half-Breeds 213, 226, 240, 321
The claims of the Half-Breeds 214, 224, 244, 268
Laws recognizing these claims 228, 261
Mgr. Taché's plan 230
Fruitless petitions of the North-West Council, officials and settlers 233, 237, 242, 246, 264, 271, 328
The surveys by square or longitudinal sections 238
Sir John's policy relative to the surveys 243
"Too Late" 266
Sir John's conduct towards the Half-Breeds 232, 235, 247, 260, 323
Death of Thomas Scott 290, 294
Mr. Chapleau and the Half-Breeds 247
Suppressed documents 220, 316
Gabriel Dumont 248, 326
Broken promises 315, 330

"Justice the same everywhere,"..... 212
The white settlers' responsibility,..... 259
The Half-Breeds' numerous petitions and deputations..... 263, 314, 324, 331
Half-Breeds dispossessed.....319, 332
Justifiable rebellions..... 488
Mercy should have been the rule..... 580

PACIFIC RAILWAY:

Conservative and Liberal policy..... 123
Three changes of policy in three years..... 125
Complete surrender to the Syndicate. 127, 129
Monopoly of the Pacific..... 130, 134, 371
A fief of twenty-five millions of acres..... 131
Tyrannized settlers..... 132
Line north of Lake Superior..... 136

PERSONAL REMARKS:

Baldwin (Hon. Robt.)..... 591
Belleau (Sir N.-F)..... 180
Blake (Hon. Edward).....141, 185, 188, 190,530, 534
Brown (Hon. George)..... 356
Cartier (Sir G.-E.)..... 155
Cartwright (Sir Richard)..... 190
Dorion (Sir A.-A.)..... 195
Durham (Lord).....346, 425
Holton (Hon. L.-H.)..... 111
Joly (Hon. H.-G.)..... 514
Lafontaine (Sir L.-H.)..... 68
Macdonald (Sir John)..... 188, 530
Mackenzie (Hon. A.)..... 189
Mercier (Hon.-H.)..... 374, 507
Papineau (Joseph)..... 590
Papineau (L. J.).....218, 351
Tupper (Sir Charles)..... 189
Wiman (Erastus)..... 482

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC:

Loyalty of the French Canadians } 249, 267, 278, 308, 349 360, 429, 520, 540, 586
Their only revenge..... 118
Did they ask pardon for Riel simply because he was French ?..... 254, 579, 616
Canadian above all.....305, 311, 359, 442, 528
Are the Protestant minority ill-treated?..... 513
French Canadians and Tory party,..... 306
Union on party lines only..... 56, 60, 72, 256, 596
Tithes..... 598
Lord Durham's report..... 591
The French Canadian Republic..... 539, 569, 613

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY:

Respective independence of the Local and Federal Legislature.....15, 204, 364, 543, 557, 561
Contradictions of the Conservatives on this question 106
Northern boundaries of Ontario and Quebec 147
Superiority of the federative system..... 166
Licenses..... 159
Attempts at Legislative Union.....165, 365
Provinces Sovereign in their sphere, Dominion united in its diversity.....2, 198, 200
Anomalies in the Constitution..... 197
Monopoly and Manitoba..... 559
Separation of legislative powers..... 361
Distribution of subsidies to the Provinces..... 374
Provincial victories of 1890..... 610
What they signify 612
The only way to maintain Confederation..... 614

RACE AND RELIGION.....220, 309, 358

RECIPROCITY:

Article of the Liberal programme..... 377, 467, 563, 568
The old Reciprocity Treaty..... 377, 452
The statutory offer of 1879..... 380, 401, 413, 457
Why the first treaty was not renewed 382, 384, 401, 454, 474

Commercial union with Great Britain...385, 432, 459, 563
Our history from the economic standpoint..... ... 398
Obstacles to interprovincial trade..... 405
Reciprocity favored by the United States 413, 455
Unlimited Reciprocity *vs* Limited Reciprocity.... 413, 417
The manufacturing interests..... 418, 456
How the loss of revenue should be supplied..... 420
The disloyalty cry..... ..... 390, 422, 434, 458, 564
Commercial independence..... 424
The annexation movement of 1849..... 427
Sir John formerly for Reciprocity 453
The scourge of emigration,.....376, 395, 446, 449
Modern industry wants large markets 409

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT 347, 426

RIEL:

His expulsion from Parliament..... 22
His amnesty..... .....31, 37, 274
His mental condition..... 282
Riel and Jackson..... 288
Sir Adolphe Caron and Riel..... 274, 286
Mr. Chapleau and Riel 292
General Middleton and Riel..... 296
Riel and the Half-Breeds.....235, 245, 336
A judicial murder.....253, 258
Sir Alex. Campbells' memorandum..... ..280, 300

TARIFF:

Variations of Sir John's party..... 42
True meaning of the " National Policy "..... 46
Retaliation policy.....47, 379,464, 472, 480
Excessive protection..... 48
The tariff and the Maritime Provinces..... 362, 478
Inanity of the N. P.....375, 411, 473
The N. P. and British connection..... 277
The " flies on the wheel "..... 451

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
GRADUATE LIBRARY

DATE DUE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 05950 3303

DO NOT REMOVE
OR
MUTILATE CARD